

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEDICATION OF THE EDWARD
P. BOLAND ROOM

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 26, 1989, you joined the majority leader, former Speaker O'Neill, past and present members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Director of Central Intelligence Webster, former Director Turner, and many officials of the U.S. intelligence community to honor our former colleague, Eddie Boland, the first chairman of the Intelligence Committee, as we dedicated the committee's meeting room, room H-405 here in the Capitol, as the "Edward P. Boland Room." This distinguished gathering was clear evidence of the special feeling we in the committee, in this House, and in the executive branch have for the gentleman from Massachusetts, the founder, as it were, of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of this House and all students of the democratic process owe a debt of gratitude to Eddie Boland for making congressional oversight of intelligence a respectable and effective process. In an effort to share this conviction with my colleagues, I insert at this point in the RECORD a transcript of the committee's proceedings dedicating the Edward P. Boland Room.

DEDICATION OF THE EDWARD P. BOLAND ROOM

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 5:00 p.m., in room H-405, The Capitol, Hon. Anthony C. Beilenson [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Beilenson, Hyde, Kastenmeier, Roe, McHugh, Dwyer, Kennelly, Glickman, Mavroules, Richardson, Solarz, Livingston, Bereuter, and Rowland.

Also present: The Hon. Edward P. Boland, Mr. BEILENSON. Will you all please come to order.

It is good to have so many good people and good friends of Eddie Boland here today. I welcome you to this celebration, and especially welcome our distinguished Speaker, Mr. Wright; our former Speaker, Mr. O'Neill, whom we are delighted to—Tip, I am talking about you—to have back here today; Mr. Leader Foley; Judge Webster; Admiral Turner; Admiral Studeman; former Chairman Lee Hamilton and Lou Stokes; our former Minority Leader on this committee, Bob Stump; present and former Members of the committee, a lot of very distinguished people from the Intelligence Community and from Intelligence-related activities of the services.

I won't introduce all of them, but it is lovely of all of you to have come out to honor our good friend Eddie Boland. Special thanks to our friends in the Massachusetts delegation who have turned out in force,

and other colleagues of ours, and ladies and gentlemen in general.

I think I have covered just about everyone except Eddie and Mary Boland and their son, whom we are pleased to welcome.

Mr. BOLAND. You forgot the security guard outside.

Mr. BEILENSON. Just so we don't forget you, sir.

This is an impressive array of friends and associates and people who care about Eddie Boland—bipartisan, across the political spectrum, from all the various parts and branches of the Government, including even some sometime political opponents, who have joined with us today to honor this man with whom they worked very well, this man, as they call him, the big Chairman, the real Chairman, the only guy that got to be Chairman for this committee for more than a year or two, as the rest of us have.

I am pleased to start off the proceedings today. I will be very brief because we have three or four other chaps who are going to say a couple of words also about Mr. Boland.

I do want to say to you, Eddie, if I may, it is really good to have you back here with us. We miss you. We miss you very much.

It gives us great pleasure to honor you today by naming this committee room, which you presided over so beautifully for so many years, in your honor. It is the least we can do. We wanted to do more. As a matter of fact, we asked the CIA if perhaps they would think about renaming one of their headquarters buildings out there in your name. They objected to it. I don't understand why.

The only reason that they are so big, that they need all the buildings out there is because you presided over a building up of the CIA, and if it hadn't been for you, they wouldn't have had so many people or needed so many buildings. But nonetheless, they turned us down so we are back naming this nice, little room after you.

In all seriousness, as the newest Chairman, only since the middle of January, of this committee, I am constantly reminded of Eddie Boland, the staff that he hired, many of whom still work for the committee. It is hard to get rid of them and it is hard to hire new people because the staff won't allow us to hire any new people. They point out in these remarks which they prepared for me—that they are among the best staff of the Hill.

We also remember Eddie because of the policies which he established on public discussion, or the lack of it, to be more precise, about intelligence matters. You don't read anything about this committee in the press. You haven't in the past, and you won't, I hope, in the future. He also established a tradition of bipartisan cooperation, which, as you all know and remember very well, was very strong under Mr. Boland, and in fact would have been stronger if it had not been for his own amendments with respect to contra aid. We could have maintained that bipartisanship a lot longer than we were able to. But we are struggling to put it all back together, and his amendment seems not so controversial anymore.

In the last few days we are reminded of Eddie by that plaque we have put up out-

side, just outside in the foyer, that I hope you saw as you came in, and if you didn't, please look at it as you go out. It will stand as a reminder of the fairness and bipartisanship and good judgment that was Eddie Boland's hallmark, and which remains the standard against which the House, the Intelligence Committee, and the public will continue—and I hope they do continue—to measure us, and correctly so.

The purpose of the Intelligence Committee is to oversee all U.S. intelligence activities, to authorize their funding, and consider all matters relating to intelligence activity of the Government. Under Mr. Boland, this committee established, and I hope retains, a reputation as a serious and forceful influence on U.S. intelligence.

We have become a partner as well as a critic. The presence of all of you from both parties in the Congress and so many branches of the Government attest to that.

We have Eddie Boland to thank for showing us the way. Both parties in the Congress attest to that. We have Eddie Boland to thank for showing us how to be that kind of committee.

I will take a half minute more to read from the resolution which is responsible for establishing the name of this room.

"Whereas the Honorable Edward P. Boland, a representative from Massachusetts who served in the House from 1953 to 1989, was the first Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,

"Whereas, under his leadership, the committee established a reputation for security, bipartisanship, and measured judgment,

"Whereas these traditions have served as norms for the activities of the committee since that time,

"Whereas Presidents Carter and Reagan, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency have honored Edward P. Boland for his leadership and support for the intelligence services of the United States, and

"Whereas it is appropriate that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence honor the contributions of Edward P. Boland in establishing effective, fair congressional oversight of intelligence activities,

"Be it resolved by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the U.S. House of Representatives that Room H-405 in the Capitol Building, the meeting room of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hereinafter be named and shall be called the 'Edward P. Boland Room,' that an appropriate memorial to this effect shall be placed at the entrance to Room H-405, and that the committee take steps to notify Edward P. Boland of this action," and invite Mr. Boland to come on down here for this celebration.

So, Eddie, congratulations to you. Thank you very much for being the inspiration you have been, and now you are going to hear a few words from each of a few more people, the first of whom is my good friend and our Ranking Republican Member, Mr. Henry Hyde.

[Applause.]

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. HYDE. Thank you very much, Tony. I shall be brief.

I tried to think of how to describe Eddie Boland, and to whom to compare him. He is really incomparable. It occurred to me, I suppose, doing the best I could do with comparisons, that he is sort of a New England Bill Natcher, righteous and respected—or perhaps Bill Natcher is a bluegrass Eddie Boland—but the type of person who hasn't an enemy in the world, who is respected and admired and emulated for his integrity and his knowledge and his commitment to the highest of legislative ideals.

Eddie told me that when he first came to Congress in 1952, like all of us, he wanted to change the world. Now he just likes to leave the room with dignity if he can, and I certainly share that feeling.

Tip O'Neill did America and the cause of intelligence a great favor by nominating Eddie as the first Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Ed Boland set a standard that has been adhered to by succeeding chairmen. His successor, Lee Hamilton is of the same stripe; his successor, Lou Stokes, outstanding; and his successor, Tony Beilenson, the high quality, the high-caliber Chairman for this committee who has followed in the footsteps of Eddie Boland, and that has got to be good for our country.

The accomplishments of Ed Boland are legion: the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Classified Information Procedures Act, the Intelligence Identity Protection Act. But I hope that history won't remember him mostly for the Boland Amendments, but indeed they are his progeny and they must be mentioned.

Eddie, in rummaging through my records, and I keep records, I found H. Con. Res. 9, introduced January 4, 1977, by Mr. Boland in the 95th Congress in the House of Representatives. It was a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee on intelligence, and this is for you.

[Applause.]

Mr. BOLAND. If I could, I did that at the suggestion of Tip O'Neill.

Mr. HYDE. I have got one by Lee Hamilton, too.

Let me just say in closing that there is a great line from Camelot where King Arthur says, "All of us are tiny drops in a vast ocean, but some of them sparkle." Eddie Boland is positively incandescent.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. BEILENSEN. We are very pleased and very honored to have our distinguished Speaker, Mr. Wright of Texas, with us today. Jim wanted very much to be here to help us honor Eddie.

Mr. Speaker.

Speaker WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Eddie, Mary, I think it is altogether appropriate that this room, which has been such a well-kept secret for so many years from so many people, should be dedicated in the name of Eddie Boland, whose remarkable qualities of leadership were for so many years a well-kept secret to the world and even from some of his colleagues.

Eddie might be called a late bloomer. He was well into his 20s before he and Mary married. If someone were to declare open season on politicians, and there were those around with shotguns and rifles wanting to bag a politician to use for a trophy in the trophy room, Eddie Boland might be fairly safe unless they knew him, because at superficial, first glance, nobody would think of Eddie Boland as a politician. He is not a

glad-handler, he isn't a back-slapper, he isn't gregarious; he is a quiet, unobtrusive, productive individual. He is the quiet man of politics. Yet, what a wonderful record he has set. What an example of those of us who came to know him, who penetrated that little bit of New England reserve that you have to penetrate to get to understand and to know what lies at the heart of Eddie Boland. He is a treasure. His friendship is a valuable possession.

It was he more than any other person who laid the keel for this committee. He set the pattern. He established the direction. He charted the course, and it has been a wonderfully productive committee that has performed enormously valuable service to the Congress of the United States, permitting us to have one central place that can be the repository of classified information. Eddie did it with such dignity and with such éclat and with such superlative skill that hardly anybody noticed, and that was the marvelous quality of his leadership.

But to Eddie Boland we owe a very great many things in this Congress, and the nation owes him 36 years of productive work, free from the fanfare of self-promotion, 36 years in the Congress, 54 years in public office, never having been rejected by an electorate, and additional years in service to the United States because he is not just a sunshine patriot.

When time of trouble came, World War II, Eddie Boland left public office to serve in the service of the United States, entering as a private and emerging as a captain. He is a soldier in peacetime, he is a patriot in peacetime and he is a great American all the time. And I am really very, very happy that we made this choice to name this room in his honor.

[Applause.]

Speaker WRIGHT. He sings a wicked baritone, too.

Mr. BOLAND. Not tonight.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Also, we are very pleased and very honored to have our former Speaker, the lovely gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman who had the good sense to put Eddie in charge here at the very beginning so that the rest of us would know how to operate afterwards when our turn finally came.

Would you like to come up here and say a word or two, sir?

Mr. O'NEILL. We better stop or I will tell a couple of old stories.

Speaker Jim Wright, Tom Foley, delighted to see you. All of my colleagues here I see—I believe all of the Massachusetts delegation. I am happy to see them. That is the first time they have been totally since I left.

[Laughter.]

Mr. O'NEILL. When I was elected as Speaker of the House and Jimmy Carter was the new President, Charles Ferris was one of my AAs, and one of Charlie's duties was on Wednesday morning at 7 o'clock down in the old Sam Rayburn Board of Education, the Speaker would meet with the CIA and we would get the records of everything that had happened during the past week. We would have a little breakfast together.

Admiral, I don't know if that was during your days or just before you came on. But anyway, after going to these meetings for about 10 weeks, I said, "This is the craziest thing I have ever heard of. They tell me every covert action, what their plans are for the future, highly confidential, and I can't tell a damn soul. I can't even go home and

tell my Millie." Only Charlie and I would know.

It was my understanding that they had to report to the Congress of the United States, so here they are reporting to me. And I said, some day something is going to blow up and they will say, "Well, we reported to the Speaker." So we came up with the idea that there ought to be an independent committee of intelligence, and that was the birth and that was the idea of how the committee got together.

Well, immediately, of course, knowing the seriousness of the committee and knowing how highly classified the information was, the main thing was getting a man with ability, talent and intelligence who would be able to keep his mouth sealed. Well, Eddie could keep a secret better than anyone I ever knew. I lived with him for 25 years and never could find the blue comb. I said, anybody that can hide the blue comb, what a master he would be at keeping a secret.

We decided that it would be a committee of six Democrats and six Republicans, and the Republicans would name their side and we would name our side of the aisle, and it would be bipartisan in nature. And we were going to take, in our opinion, some of the best and most talented and most able people in the Congress who we would have absolute confidence and trust in.

The truth of the matter was, they did a fantastic job. Eddie molded the committee together. Eddie was a man who gave real input to the intelligence committee. He developed, as Henry Hyde said, what the committee really stands for.

I know that this is probably the greatest thing I ever accomplished in my 34 years in Congress. But, Eddie, looking back, I say how proud I am that I had a friend as close as you, that we did sit down together and take the youngest and brightest minds, and we did put a committee of this type together. And here you are today, your friends are here, to honor you, Democrats and Republicans in the Congress are here.

Eddie, it is great to be able to look back and say, well, there is so much that I have written in the law of intelligence. So with these people who are honoring you, they are honoring themselves and they are honoring the Congress, the greatest body in the world.

Mary and Eddie, may you have longevity and peace and satisfaction, and you can always look back, as Jim Wright said, to 54 years in public life. It could have gone to 64 had it not been your own desire to leave.

Congratulations. How honored and pleased I am that they are honoring us in your memory.

[Applause.]

Mr. BEILENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for those lovely remarks.

We have just one more gentleman who is going to make brief remarks before we hear from Mr. Boland himself for whatever he wants to sing or talk—that is up to him.

We are delighted and honored to have with us the Director of Central Intelligence, the gentleman from Langley, Judge Webster. I must say that if Lou Stokes and I do decent jobs as Chairman of this committee, it is because we had this gentleman to deal with instead of the former Director. He seems to be leveling with us. He is good to work with, and we are delighted and proud to have him with us here today.

[Applause.]

Judge WEBSTER. Thank you, Chairman Beilenson, and I appreciate very much your letting me represent the Intelligence Com-

munity on this very important occasion. We are honored to take part in honoring Edward P. Boland for the naming of this historic room.

There is so much history involved in this room and a good deal of that history is represented by the people who have come here to honor you today.

I must say that if Chairman Boland had not set the tone or charted the course, as Speaker Wright said, I might be appearing here exercising my right as a defendant to take the stand in my own behalf.

[Laughter.]

Judge WEBSTER. But that is not the case, and we have established a working relationship that succeeding chairmen have been faithful to and we have tried to be faithful to ourselves.

I think the thing that Congressman Hyde mentioned, so many of the important acts of legislation affecting the Intelligence Community and its ability to serve the nation, track back to Chairman Boland. The one we remember him, I suppose, the most for is the Intelligence Protection of Identities Act, which was cast by many in First Amendment terms and therefore made it difficult to approach the problem of protecting our most precious resource, our sources and methods.

But by having a distinguished and respected leader of Congress state the case for finding a way to rationalize our responsibilities, to be accountable to the Congress through its surrogate, this committee, it was possible for us to protect those very precious sources that enabled us to do our job. We will always be grateful for that.

His words are beautiful. They are articulate and they are true. I won't take up your time by quoting them. I was prepared to do that, but I want you to know you are well remembered for the balanced and important view that you took and the fairness that you showed with it.

There was a suggestion from Chairman Beilenson that we might want to name one of our buildings out at Langley for Chairman Boland, and the only thing I could say is, if we were naming buildings out there, you would be very high on our list.

[Laughter.]

Judge WEBSTER. As one who lived in a building for nine years that the Congress threatened to rename annually, you would be very high on our list. I would have thought I would go out and find a place where there were no names. [Laughter.]

Judge WEBSTER. I know it will be a pleasure to come up here and report to the Congress and the House in a room with your name on it.

[Applause.]

Mr. BEILENSEN. Eddie Boland just asked if I wouldn't call on three or four other good friends of his to say nice and good things about him because he is enjoying their remarks, but I told him it is a quarter of 6:00 and some of these people have to leave. But they don't want to leave until they hear from you.

So, Mr. Chairman, please come up and say a few words to us.

[Applause.]

Mr. BOLAND. I have got a lot of pages of remarks here. First of all, I think probably this will go down as the longest standing group that ever came into this room. You won't be standing for long anyhow.

First of all, I want to express my very deep appreciation to Speaker Wright and to Speaker O'Neill and to Bill Webster and to Stansfield Turner and to all of those who

have been associated with CIA, the NSA, the FBI and Defense Intelligence and all of the intelligence agencies that go to make our intelligence the finest in the world.

I had some trepidation when I came into this room and saw the food and then I saw Henry Hyde was here. I decided to make sure there wasn't any problem with it, so I made sure he ate it first.

Also, I take some pride in the fact that any time I can get Mort Halperin and Henry Hyde and others into the room at the same time, we haven't done too bad a job.

As Tip has said, we looked at this problem some years ago in the Carter Administration and decided that—we were not the ones that decided; as a matter of fact, the President of the United States himself decided, and there was no question about the fact—there was absolute necessity creating this particular committee.

We are deeply honored—Mary and Edward, who is here with me, and Martha, Michael and Kathleen who are back home. In honoring me, of course, you honor them, too. I say that from the bottom of my heart.

I particularly want to pay my respects to Lou Stokes and Nick Mavroules and Bernie Dwyer and Tony Beilenson for getting together and suggesting that this be done.

My only regret is that Ken Robinson, who served as the committee's ranking Republican with me for some six years of this committee, could not be here. He was in every way my partner and a very close friend. This nation was well-served by the effort and the work that he put in when he was Ranking Minority Member of this committee. No one, no one did more on the Minority side during my period as chairmanship of this committee than did he, and no one was a more superb gentleman than he was.

I did spend a lot of time up here in this attic, more than I ever presumed I would, ever dreamed that I would. I will never forget that one day I decided I had to be a little skeptical of what I heard up here, especially when I was being briefed from the wall map, which, unlike the ones the rest of the world uses, has two Africas on it. I had difficulty following some of the directions.

I did spend considerable time, as the staff knows and those who come before this committee know, from 1977 on trying to set the standards and to hire a staff that would serve intelligence oversight and the House not only in those days during my chairmanship, but those that succeeded me—Lee Hamilton, Lou Stokes and Tony Beilenson—but also those who were on the Minority side. Yet, I couldn't have accomplished any of this without the strong support of Speaker O'Neill and Speaker Wright and Bob Michel. Bob Michel was an old friend of ours when Tip and I—in the Cannon Building—when Tip and I came first here and were sworn in, in 1953.

This committee could not have acquired the reputation that it has without the cooperation and the hard work and the interest demonstrated by the Members of the committee who served with me during my tenure, not to mention those of you who carry on this work today and uphold the committee's reputation.

I think serving on this committee is probably one of the highest honors that Members could attain. You are very special people who serve on this committee, and one of the reasons for it is the trust that the Members of the House have in you, and actually the members of the press have in you, too. So I can't take all the credit. I think the credit belongs to those who served

during my tenure and the tenures of those Chairs who succeeded me.

I also want to pay my respects to the staff. I don't think that any staff—was put together as carefully and as cautiously as this staff was put together. I never made one political appointment to this staff, except that I brought over from my district office from the congressional office one of my AAs, Michael O'Neill. Mike O'Neill, that was the only suggestion I made. I am glad that I did.

That staff, I think, probably is as good as any staff on this Hill. I must say also about the staffs on this Hill, the Appropriations Committee in particular, you won't find better staffs anywhere in this nation.

I think early on we not alone myself, but those who served with me on either side of this table up here—set some very simple rules, and that was every Member would be fully cognizant and fully involved in the committee's proceedings, and that was so from day one; that we would be insistent on obtaining information we needed but fully protective of the intelligence that we received; and that we would work to earn the trust of the House and the confidence of the Intelligence Community; and that our key goals would be the best possible intelligence system, responding, of course, to the policy makers and protective of the privacy rights of the people of the United States.

I think we did manage to achieve progress towards those goals. We have a strong Intelligence Community, probably the finest Intelligence Community in the world, and despite some noticeable exceptions, we developed a modicum of trust between the branches, which was not easy to do, and an acceptance of the need and the usefulness of congressional oversight.

We funded the largest peacetime buildup of intelligence capabilities in our history, starting with Stan Turner. We worked through legislation, as Henry Hyde has said, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Classified Information Procedures Act. We advanced national security concerns.

We advanced them by really protecting the individual rights of the people that go to make up this great nation, and we were able to provide other committees and the public with careful, yet substantive statements on questions involving intelligence like the KAL-007 tragedy, Jonestown and Billy Carter.

To me, however, the most enduring memory and the greatest accomplishment is that this committee and its processes, particularly its staff, have become institutions that are respected both in the House and by the intelligence agencies, and that was our hope.

This event, the people who are here tonight, clearly demonstrates and confirms for me that we were successful. So I thank you all again. It is nice to be a part, a piece of the rock here.

This is a great building, one of the greatest in the world. And I repeat, to me, this ceremony says one thing quite clearly: Intelligence oversight really has arrived. It is a function which continues to be critical to this House and which must be constantly reviewed. I think it will remain in good health only through its vigorous—vigorous—exercise.

Sir William Stevenson said it best in *The Man Called Intrepid*, and many of you have heard me quote him quite often. I will repeat it once more: "Among the increasingly intricate arsenals across the world, intelligence is an essential weapon, perhaps the

most important, but it is being secret the most dangerous. Safeguards to prevent its abuse must be devised and revised and rigidly applied. But as in all enterprise, the character and wisdom of those to whom it is entrusted will be decisive. In the integrity of that guardianship lies the hope of a free people to endure and to prevail."

That has been the intention of this committee ever since I have been the Chairman and of all the Members who have served here. It has been my pleasure and honor and privilege to have served with so many of them over the seven years that I presided over this committee. It was a great job. It was a great job because the people that worked with me were great people.

So, Tony and Lou and Lee Hamilton and Henry Hyde and all the others who served on this committee, and some of the new ones, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for what you have done here. It is a unique honor, and I appreciate it very deeply, as my family does, too.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Mr. BEILENSON. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 6:00 p.m., the committee adjourned.]

THOMAS SUTHERLAND REMAINS A HOSTAGE

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this Friday evening, June 9, the sound of bagpipes will spill over the campus of Colorado State University. Friday marks the beginning of the fifth year of captivity for my friend Tom Sutherland, who is a hostage in Lebanon. The pipes will be a call of hope triumphing over despair, of love over hate, of freedom over captivity.

Born in Scotland and a naturalized United States citizen, Tom is 58 years old. His wife, Jean, and their three daughters, Joan, Kit, and Ann, have faced this tragic situation with exceptional courage and strength. For 25 years, Tom and his family lived in Fort Collins, CO, where he was a professor of animal sciences at Colorado State University. An exceptional individual and an outstanding educator, Tom took a 3-year leave of absence from Colorado State and accepted a position at the American University of Beirut as dean of the faculty of agriculture and food sciences.

On June 10, 1985, Tom returned to Beirut after a short visit to Colorado. On his way from the Beirut Airport, Tom's motorcade was stopped by five cars of armed men, who sprayed automatic weapons' fire, shattering the windshield of the car Tom was riding in and flattening its tires. Tom was the only American in his group, and he was the only one kidnaped. Fortunately, he appeared to be uninjured from the attack. Unfortunately, no one has heard from him directly or indirectly since May 1988. He is being held by a shadowy group called Islamic Jihad, strongly linked to the Iranian-backed Hezbollah.

We do not know precisely who perpetrated this crime. We do not know precisely where Tom is. But we do know what kind of man Tom Sutherland is. He is a brave man, a man who stayed in Beirut with the sole purpose of keeping the American University open, to keep a small flame of civilization alive in that war-torn country. He stayed, even though he knew there was danger. But he is not a reckless man.

No one expects to be brutally kidnaped amidst a hail of bullets. No one expects to be held incommunicado, deprived of liberty, isolated from family, friends, colleagues and countrymen. No one expects to be held as a tool of ruthless terrorists engaged in international blackmail.

Tom's wife, Jean, is a remarkable woman. She has not given into the despair or bitterness that others might feel given a similar situation. She has faced this crisis bravely and clear eyed.

Jean continues to believe that Americans must meet the challenge of a changing world, to help shape change, to assist those in foreign lands who wish to help themselves. Jean remained in Beirut the past 4 years, teaching English at the American University. This spring, intense artillery shelling made staying there impractical, so she has spent time in Scotland and the United States seeing friends and family to renew her spirit. Jean will be in Fort Collins Friday as Tom's friends gather to let the world know he has not been forgotten.

The death of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini in Iran offers the possibility of change and of new approaches. Iranians are scheduled to vote for a president on August 18 as well as a referendum on the powers of that office. My hope is that President Bush and Secretary of State Baker will seize this chance to explore the possibility of a new relationship with Iran, consistent with United States policies and interests.

So as we mark the fourth year of unwarranted captivity for Tom Sutherland, let us assure his captors in Lebanon and their mentors in Iran that they have nothing to gain by holding him except the scorn of the world. If Iran wants to rejoin the family of nations, surely it must know that it can no longer sponsor groups that take hostages.

Jean Sutherland said she recently visited Tom's former neighbor in Scotland, a man in his nineties and a veteran of World War I. The neighbor told her that when things seemed darkest in the trenches of that war, off in the distance the sound of bagpipes often would drift over the lines, stirring the souls of the soldiers and giving them hope and fighting spirit. When the Northern Colorado Pipe Band plays Friday night in Colorado for Tom, let us hope that somehow the spirit of those pipes will drift to the spot in Lebanon where he is held prisoner, to let him know there is hope for freedom.

Let us remember Tom and keep him in our hearts. Together, let us pray for the day when Tom and the others, held so cruelly and unjustly in Lebanon, are set free.

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC SURTAX REPEAL ACT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in supporting the Medicare Catastrophic Surtax Repeal Act. This legislation would repeal the income-related surtax which many elderly would pay as a result of the Catastrophic Coverage Protection Act which was enacted last year. The law was enacted to assist the elderly who face the risk of financial ruin as a result of catastrophic illness. As it is now financed, however, the law places an undue burden on millions of middle income elderly and should be reworked.

This legislation would take a financing approach which more closely resembles Congress' original intention of the Catastrophic Protection Act—equitable and progressive financing which does not burden the elderly the law is meant to protect. The bill would repeal the income related surtax while retaining all benefits of the original law. The program will be financed by extending the 33-percent tax bracket to individuals making over \$109,050 and families of four making over \$208,510, about 600,000 taxpayers.

I understand the impact these costs have on the elderly. Many elderly carefully plan their financial retirement and find these costs prohibitive. The Medicare Catastrophic Surtax Repeal Act will provide relief for senior citizens while keeping this very important program for Medicare beneficiaries.

THE KOREA TIMES CELEBRATES ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a highly successful, well-respected newspaper in Los Angeles, CA, which currently serves the fastest growing ethnic population in the United States. Founded in 1969 as a subsidiary of a Seoul-based Han-kook Ilbo, the Korea Times has developed into the largest daily newspaper serving the interests of Korean and Korean-American readers and advertisers. Headquartered in Los Angeles, the Korea Times operates a network of 14 branch offices and news bureaus throughout North and South America. During the past 20 years, it has increased its daily circulation to more than 150,000 subscribers in major Korean communities nationwide. The Korea Times now receives satellite news transmission which facilitates same day coverage of Korean news and events. It also provides home delivery service to many southern California area residents.

In news and editorial content, the Korea Times strives to provide timely and accurate reporting, without prejudice or bias. It effectively combines the local, regional, national,

and international interests throughout a worldwide network of news bureaus and branch offices. With the dramatic growth of Korean population and the increase in economic and social awareness, the Korea Times has managed to grow with the community and reflect the changing interests and concerns of Korean people and the community.

In total advertising volume, the Korea Times has led all other ethnic newspapers in the Nation. The Los Angeles edition alone runs a classified section with an average of over 3,000 items each day. For those advertisers targeting Korean consumers and the business community, it has become a standard business practice to advertise in the Korea Times.

But what counts most at the Korea Times is the quality of its staff and the commitment to excellence. The staff is dedicated to true and fair reporting. They genuinely care about their community. In delivery of news and information, the staff seeks to provide in-depth analysis and clear evaluation of news to assist our readers with the demands of day-to-day immigration living.

Mr. Speaker, the Korea Times will be celebrating its 20th anniversary this Friday evening, June 9 at the Wilshire Hyatt Hotel. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing the staff of the Korea Times continued success and fortune for many years to come. Happy 20th anniversary.

REINVIGORATING THE CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 7, 1989, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A shorter version of this piece originally appeared in the Washington Post.

REINVIGORATING THE CONGRESS

Members of Congress have had some unpleasant reading in recent days. One editorial writer says the Congress needs a bath. Headlines tell us we are stuck in an ethics quagmire. Polls remind us that the dominant attitudes expressed by people toward the Congress are cynicism and mistrust. One poll says that three out of four Americans believe that Members of Congress will lie if the truth will hurt them politically; that three in four say that Members favor special interests over the needs of the average citizen; and that more than half of all Americans believe that lawmakers profit improperly from their office. Adding to this is a state of disarray in the Congress, a lack of important initiatives, and suspicion and acrimony. It is time to reinvigorate the Congress. The public's business is not being taken care of.

The problem is not one of complete legislative inactivity. The President and the Congress reached a quick agreement on the 1990 budget and U.S. policy in Nicaragua, and are tackling the savings-and-loan bailout and other problems swept aside during the Reagan years. It is more a feeling that we are not dealing with the serious problems facing our nation as effectively as we know we should and that too much of our

time is being devoted to peripheral issues. It is a sense of opportunity being lost. Some Members have told me that they are almost embarrassed to go home to constituents now and talk about congressional "accomplishments".

As a body we need to take several steps to reinvigorate the institution of the Congress:

First, we need to enact a package of tough ethics reforms. Tightening congressional ethics rules would not distract the Congress, as some would claim, but would clarify the standards for Members and increase public confidence in the Congress. We should tighten congressional rules on gifts and the use of campaign funds, and further limit sources of outside income to reduce potential conflicts of interest. We should also clarify our Code of Official Conduct to make it clear to Members that their conduct should conform to broad standards of good conduct, whether or not they may technically avoid some of the legalistic nuances of a specific rule. We need to greatly expand the "preventative ethics" role of the Standards Committee—broadening its advisory and informational efforts to try to head off possible cases of misconduct before they occur.

Second, we need to reform our campaign finance laws. Members must spend an enormous amount of time fundraising, and special interest money is flooding our system of government in unprecedented amounts. We should give candidates incentives (such as reduced postage rates and discounted broadcasting costs) to accept campaign spending limits. We should lessen the power of special interest PACs by, for example, capping the amount of PAC contributions a candidate could accept and curbing "independent expenditures".

Third, we should support a modest pay increase tied to a ban on honoraria. A modest increase to partially offset past losses due to inflation, plus indexing future pay, might be perceived as reasonable. In return, we should ban all congressional honoraria. Banning speaking fees paid by special interests would go a long way toward restoring public confidence in the Congress, but there is no chance of eliminating honoraria without a pay raise, since an outright ban would seriously reduce most Members' current income.

Fourth, we need to stop the partisan ethics attacks on one another. Much of the damage to the House in recent months has been self-inflicted, as each party attacks the ethics of opposing members for political advantage. Instead the attacks stop both sides from going ahead with their agenda and the entire institution becomes tainted. Leaders of both parties need to sit down and talk about reining in the attacks to allow us to get down to the serious business of governing. We seem to have lost sight of the fact that the first duty of all Members of Congress is to work together to govern effectively.

Fifth, we in the Congress need to stop bad-mouthing the institution of the Congress. We need to stop running for Congress by running against Congress, and tearing it down in order to make ourselves look good. Americans will not acclaim an institution which their own Members disclaim. Members who make distorted, demeaning statements about the Congress should face disciplinary action. Most Members of Congress are honest, conscientious, and hardworking and we should start saying that.

Sixth, we need to enact institutional reforms to improve the effectiveness of the

Congress. We need to reduce the excessive number of subcommittees tying up legislation, cut down the number of times the same issue is considered on the floor, and make it more difficult to miss budget deadlines. We also need to stop hiding tax and spending benefits for narrow interests behind obscure language in omnibus bills. The Congress must be able to pull itself together and produce a program to respond to the issues of the day. It currently does not have the integrative mechanisms to mobilize itself, blend its product into a consistent policy, and give the country a sense of direction. We need to strengthen the capacity of the Congress to govern.

Finally, we need to tackle the tough problems on the American agenda. We have become too timid legislatively, often dealing with issues that are of only marginal interest to most Americans, while avoiding the tough issues to protect our chances of re-election. We need to stop playing games with the budget, go after popular but counterproductive tax benefits, and make the kinds of investments—in education, research and development, and infrastructure—that are needed for securing America's economic future. One of the best ways for the Congress to become respected again is for it to do a respectable job.

We are in a rough patch now, but I have confidence in the Congress and its ability to overcome its problems. Getting our own house in order, Members recognize, is essential if we are to get on with taking care of the nation's business.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1982, the Congress of the United States commemorated the anniversary of Genocide Day in the Baltic republics with a resolution to proclaim June 14 "Baltic Freedom Day."

The Baltic region, comprised of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, lies on the eastern shores of the Soviet Union. They are a very proud people with a very long and unique history. Cultural diversity and pride in such diversity defines the Baltic people.

Baltic Freedom Day was proclaimed in recognition of the undying will for freedom of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Furthermore, it is evidence that the United States must stand firm against unwanted Soviet expansionism.

Following a history of conquest, the Baltic States were once again suppressed in 1941 by the Soviet Army. Violations in civil, personal, and political liberties ensued as the Soviet Union imposed its control over the proud people of the Baltic.

Baltic Freedom Day is integral to our continuing efforts to make human rights and freedom of utmost concern. We focus here on a people who are clear reminders that there are individuals who are unwillingly suppressed and who have no political voice.

The United States continues individual relations with the nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia as evidence of nonrecognition of

Soviet control. Furthermore, it celebrates Baltic Freedom Day not only to commemorate the desire and integrity of its suppressed people, but also to make a statement for the future. This statement is a cry on behalf of the United States, the citizens of the Baltic, and Baltic-Americans, as well. It is a voice for future freedom and a reminder that the will of these noble and gallant people for independence is a loud and undying cry.

JEFFERSON COUNTY OFFERS CONGRESS GOOD, COMMON-SENSE ADVICE

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, more than 10,000 residents of Jefferson County, AL, responded this year to my annual congressional questionnaire. Congress would do well to follow their advice, and I would like to share their answers with my colleagues in the House.

Of those responding, almost half, 47 percent, felt that deficit reduction was the most important issue facing Congress and the administration. Eleven percent felt that protection of American jobs from unfair foreign competition was the second most important issue facing Congress. Less than 10 percent felt education, job training and antidrug and crime enforcement efforts were most important, and only 5 percent felt arms reductions talks with the Soviets were most important.

A freeze on Federal spending, except Social Security and Medicare, was viewed as the best way to reduce the deficit by almost 40 percent, while about one-third felt across-the-board spending reduction was the best policy.

When asked about domestic and military spending levels, 60 percent felt that the Federal Government was spending too much on domestic programs. Almost 50 percent felt that defense spending was too high, with 51 percent favoring decreased defense spending to lower the Federal deficit.

Fifty-seven percent supported raising the minimum wage from \$3.35 to \$4.55 over a 3-year period. Respondents were divided on the Government's role in child care, however, with one-third favoring Federal tax credits to assist families with child care costs, and another one-third opposing any government role, State or Federal.

Those responding were also divided on the new catastrophic health care addition to Medicare, with 23 percent approving the coverage, 30 percent desiring its repeal, and 37 percent favoring the coverage if its financing were altered.

An overwhelming 72 percent favored the adoption of policies to limit imports from countries that compete unfairly with U.S. goods, even if it resulted in higher consumer prices.

As always, the views of the people of the Sixth District of Alabama help me do a better job of representing Jefferson County in Congress, and I thank the more than 10,000 residents who took the time to respond to my questionnaire. I place in the RECORD the entire questionnaire results for my colleagues, and encourage them to heed this good Alabama commonsense advice.

CONGRESSMAN BEN ERDREICH'S 1989 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[Total number of respondents: 10,115]

	Percent	Number
1. The new Congress and new Administration face a broad range of issues in 1989. Rank the following in order of importance to you, with "1" being most important, and "8" being least important.		
a. Reduce the deficit.....	47	4,761
b. Protect American jobs from unfair foreign competition.....	11	1,087
c. Strengthen programs that help families.....	6	622
d. Negotiate further arms reductions with the Soviet Union.....	5	455
e. Improve protection of environment.....	9	859
f. Encourage and expand economic growth.....	8	833
g. Enhance quality of education and training.....	9	869
h. Strengthen anti-drug and crime enforcement efforts.....	14	1,386
2. Which of the following do you think is the best way to reduce the Federal budget deficit? (choose one)		
a. Reduce Federal spending across-the-board.....	34	3,417
b. Freeze Federal spending across-the-board.....	11	1,130
c. Freeze Federal spending across-the-board, except for Social Security.....	39	3,946
3. If your answer to the above question did not eliminate deficit spending, would you support a combination of restraint on all Federal spending and new tax increases?		
a. Yes.....	38	3,799
b. No.....	54	5,425
4. Do you think the current level of Federal domestic spending is		
a. About right?.....	20	2,068
b. Too much?.....	61	6,130
c. Too little?.....	14	1,450
5. Do you think the current level of defense spending is		
a. About right?.....	42	4,209
b. Too much?.....	48	4,845
c. Too little?.....	8	768
6. Following is a list of some key parts of the budget. Indicate those you favor cutting in order to reduce the Federal deficit.		
a. Social Security and Medicare.....	13	1,297
b. Federal aid to education.....	39	3,899
c. Welfare.....	68	6,832
d. Veterans benefits.....	24	2,436
e. Environmental protection.....	25	2,540
f. Defense.....	51	5,142
g. Highway funds.....	42	4,178
h. Manned space flight.....	60	6,090
7. Congress is currently considering bills to make child care more accessible and affordable. Which one of the following options do you favor most?		
a. Federal funding for child care services meeting Federal standards.....	9	861
b. Tax credits to assist families with child care costs.....	32	3,274
c. No Federal role; let states run their own programs.....	17	1,711
d. No government role; let families and church groups provide.....	34	3,431
8. The current minimum wage, last set by law in 1981, is \$3.35. Would you favor a proposal to increase the minimum wage over 3 years to \$4.55 an hour?		
a. Yes.....	57	5,740
b. No.....	39	3,953
9. The catastrophic health care addition to Medicare broadens coverage with its entire cost paid by beneficiaries. Do you (choose one):		
a. Approve of this new coverage?.....	23	2,384
b. Want to see it repealed?.....	30	2,968
c. Want to keep the coverage but alter its financing?.....	37	3,706
10. Do you favor adopting policies to limit imports from countries that compete unfairly with U.S. goods, even if it means higher consumer prices?		
a. Yes.....	72	7,285
b. No.....	25	2,504

Note: Total response percentages on some questions may not equal 100% because all respondents did not answer all of the questions

MAJ. GEN. CARL D. WALLACE:
WORDS FOR OUR YOUNG
PEOPLE

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, the importance of many of our national holidays is often associated with the time we have away from work or school. The true meaning of the holiday is too often obscured by the store sales and the other commercial and recreational activities we pursue during those long weekends.

But, during those holidays, we should pause and reflect, even if momentarily, on the reason the holiday is being celebrated. And, as parents, I believe it is critical that we share with our children reflections of what the holiday means to us as Americans.

Because we just celebrated Memorial Day, it is appropriate to share the words of one for whom Memorial Day has special meaning, especially when the words are written for a young audience.

Mr. Speaker, I have attached an article written by Maj. Gen. Carl D. Wallace, Tennessee's adjutant general, which appeared on the Nashville Tennessean's School news activity page. As a professional military man, General Wallace offers, in simple yet eloquent words, his personal views on the meaning of Memorial Day. It is an article worth sharing with my colleagues and with all Americans.

I invite everyone to read it.

MILITARY MAN TELLS HIS PERSONAL VIEWS OF MEMORIAL DAY

(By Maj. Gen. Carl D. Wallace, Adjutant General of Tennessee)

If, in the days of our lives, we have stood at the tomb of a fallen soldier or spoken to a group on the 4th of July, then we can understand a little more about this thing we call "freedom."

Each of us will do something similar sometime in our lives for the same reason—to remind ourselves that the freedoms we enjoy today were not secured without great cost.

The price was steep. The expense was a heavy burden. The payment was made with the blood from the men and women of our armed forces.

Memorial Day is a date set aside to remember. Originally called "Decoration Day," Memorial Day is one of our oldest national holidays. The first observance can be traced back to 1868 when the Grand Army of the Republic, the country's first veterans organization, set May 30 as the day for decorating the graves of our military men who died in battle.

However, the roots of Memorial Day go back even further. In 1863, women in Columbus, Miss., began the tradition by decorating the graves of their Confederate soldiers. When they noticed the unkempt graves of the Union troops, the women also cleared those areas and placed flowers on their graves.

Although the holiday originally came about to honor those killed in the Civil War, it has taken on a broader meaning over the years. Now it is the one day set aside for remembering all who have died in wars to preserve our country's freedoms.

Many Americans have fought and died so that all of us can continue to be free. It is a freedom we too often accept as guaranteed.

Many look at this day as a holiday from work to enjoy with families, to fish, to golf or to do a thousand other things.

As a person whose entire adult life has been associated with the military, I believe that those who died did so for the purpose of offering a better life for all of us who live. Thus, Memorial Day is a time to remember. It is a time to pledge anew that we will do what we must to preserve that memory.

It is wrong that people should die as a result of war. It is wrong that so many have died.

I stood at the grave of a soldier last year in Normandy, France. This soldier was a Tennessean—I placed a single rose on his grave. He died in the D-Day invasion, the largest single assault during World War II.

He scaled the cliffs at Normandy in an effort to rid the European continent of Nazism. He died to extend the purposes and ideals of a free America. He died, as did other Americans, so that the peoples of Europe could enjoy freedoms today.

I have stood many times at the fence which divides East and West Germany. That fence was built not to keep people from coming into democratic West Germany, but rather to keep people in the communist East from coming out.

I have talked with the mayor of a small French village who was working in his farm fields on D-Day. He was accidentally shot by American soldiers. You would think that he wouldn't like Americans. But he does!

Why? Because American and other allied forces returned freedom to his native France.

As a young man or woman studying in a classroom, you too can be an effective spokesperson for our country and world. In our native land there are always those who doubt freedom. There are always those who believe that nothing they do will make a difference, but this is not so.

Voting, working with local communities, working with youth activities, working in senior citizen centers, working to make government work, are but a few of the ways you can make a difference.

So, why Memorial Day?

It is a day to remember. A time to pray; a time to reflect on the past and dream for the future. It is a time for living for those who have died.

You and I are living memorials to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

You and I are the world today, ready to accept the challenge of tomorrow.

THE ARIZONA DESERT WILDERNESS ACT AND THE ARIZONA REFUGE WILDERNESS ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, the Arizona congressional delegation completed several years of hard work with enactment of the Arizona Wilderness Act. That law not only designated more than 1 million acres of wilderness on Arizona's national forests and on its public lands north of the Grand Canyon. The bipartisan cooperation that characterized

that legislation also demonstrated that people of strong but divergent views can work together to resolve the always contentious wilderness debate in a way that is both fair and constructive.

Today, I am very pleased to introduce two additional measures—the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act and the Arizona Refuge Wilderness Act—which together would resolve most of the remaining wilderness issues in Arizona. The bills I put before the House today represent my thoughts about the areas that the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have reviewed as to their suitability for designation as wilderness.

I want to stress that these are initial proposals—I have included areas that in my opinion strongly deserve serious discussion and consideration. But I expect that as I, the rest of the Arizona delegation and the Congress work with the people of Arizona we are likely to add and subtract areas as well as make substantial boundary adjustments to areas contained in these bills. In other words, the field is open and I intend to approach the coming discussions and decisions with an open and flexible mind.

I would like to take a moment to outline what these bills propose. The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act addresses lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. Acting as directed by section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, BLM in Arizona, as in other States, has conducted a comprehensive review of its roadless areas. About 2.2 million of the 14.8 million acres managed by BLM in Arizona have been identified as 70 wilderness study areas [WSA's]. Of these 2.2 million acres, 1.1 million acres and 36 areas have been recommended for wilderness by the Arizona BLM. My proposal includes all the areas recommended by BLM and adds 18 more areas, for a total of about 1.45 million acres.

The areas added include lands with vital and rapidly disappearing riparian zones, such as Gila Box, Upper Burro Creek, Hassayampa River Canyon, and others. They also include areas contiguous to WSA's that were recommended for wilderness by BLM, but deemed unsuitable themselves. These include the Little Horn Mountains and East Clanton Hills in the Eagletail Mountain vicinity and the Black Mountains, Ives Peak, and Tres Alamos areas in the Arastra Mountains. Certain individual areas merit special attention such as White Canyon, Face Mountain, and Saddle Mountain.

This legislation also contains language directed at the issue of Federal reserved water rights in wilderness areas. This issue has been a major bone of contention in the Congress for several years. It has been my position and the position of the House that special language addressing Federal water rights in wilderness areas is adequately addressed by current law and judicial interpretation. I still believe this view to be essentially correct. However, recent opinions issued by the Interior and Justice Departments, which I believe to be deeply flawed, require at this time that we speak plainly on this matter. Therefore, the legislation I am introducing includes language drawn from similar provisions agreed to in deliberations over the San Pedro Riparian Na-

tional Conservation Area in the 100th Congress and substantively identical to language in S. 1080, introduced last month by Senators DENNIS DECONCINI and JOHN MCCAIN.

My bill does not offer language directed at an issue much on the minds of hunters, sportsmen and game managers in Arizona. They believe that current law, regulation and policy does not adequately provide for the continuation of wildlife management activities in wilderness areas. I am not convinced that this is the case. However, I recognize that some ambiguity may exist in this area and that it may be necessary for the Congress to address these issues in some fashion as part of its deliberations on this legislation.

The Arizona Refuge Wilderness Act addresses wilderness designations of the four wildlife refuges in Arizona. The Imperial, Havasau, Kofa and Cabeza Prieta Wildlife Refuges were all studied by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the early 1970's. President Gerald Ford recommended that Congress designate wilderness of the Kofa Refuge in 1976 after President Richard Nixon had favorably recommended the other three in 1974. Since that time, they have been managed to protect their wilderness characteristics—in effect, all four refuges have been subject to wilderness management for about 15 years.

My bill would conform with the Presidential recommendations. There is considerable controversy surrounding all of the refuges, and I note that S. 1080 does not designate wilderness on either Kofa or Cabeza Prieta, by far the two largest refuges. I believe that virtually everyone involved in these refuges is generally happy with the management they have received these past 14 years and that it would be a serious mistake to retreat from that posture now. Wilderness designation need not interfere with appropriate wildlife management activities, which by law would remain the prime directive of refuge managers; with public access, which would continue by virtue of existing road corridors; or with military operations in the airspace above the refuges, which are provided for in other law and memoranda of understanding.

One issue not addressed in this second bill is the question of the addition of approximately 80,000 acres in the Tanajas Altas Mountains to the Cabeza Prieta Refuge. This proposal was also made by President Ford in 1976 and by Senators MCCAIN and DECONCINI last year. Questions have been raised about the effect on ongoing military activities if Tinajas Altas is included in the refuge or possibly also designated as wilderness. I think it is very important that Tinajas Altas be protected whether by addition to the refuge or some other means and it is my intention that this legislation be the vehicle to that end. I am not at this time, however, prepared to make a specific proposal in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these two bills offer a bold and responsible resolution of Arizona's public land and refuge wilderness issues. We in the Arizona congressional delegation have a lot of work to do to reach a final accord, but we have demonstrated before that a fair and reasonable compromise can be achieved and I am confident that we will be able to do so again.

TRIBUTE TO MSGR. EMMANUEL M. CAPOZZELLI ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ORDINATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 11, 1989, residents of my Eighth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey will join the parish community of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church of Montclair and Msgr. Emmanuel M. Capozzelli in celebration of the 40th anniversary of his consecration into the sacrament of holy orders.

Mr. Speaker, the faith and devotion of our people in a full communion of understanding—ever caring and respecting the individual religious beliefs of our fellow man has been the lifeline of our democracy—ever inspiring our people with hope and urging the individual on to great achievements and purpose in fulfillment of his or her dreams and ambitions. The exemplary leadership and outstanding efforts of our citizens so important to our quality of life are in the vanguard of the American dream, and today we express our appreciation to Msgr. Emmanuel M. Capozzelli whose esteemed dedication and unselfish devotion in promulgating spiritual guidance, good will, fellowship and brotherhood in service to God have truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

Monsignor Capozzelli has maintained the highest standards of excellence throughout his lifetime, and we are pleased to share the pride of his family, many, many friends and parishioners in his distinguished achievements so unselfishly dedicated to the betterment of mankind. These is so much that can be said of the love, affection and reverence with which Monsignor Capozzelli is held by all who have had the good fortune to know him.

Mr. Speaker, we are so proud to have Monsignor Capozzelli with us in Montclair, NJ. He is the pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Montclair, where he has served with the highest dedication for the past two decades.

Monsignor Capozzelli, a native of Lattimer, PA, received his B.A. from Seton Hall and completed his philosophical and theological studies and received his master of divinity degree from Immaculate Conception Seminary in Darlington, PA. Following his ordination in St. Patrick's Pro-Cathedral in Newark on June 11, 1949, Monsignor Capozzelli was appointed associate pastor of St. Anthony's Church in Union City, NJ, where he served until 1956. In 1957 he was assigned to Our Lady of Sorrows Parish, Jersey City, where he assumed the position of school administrator. He continued his work there until 1969, when Monsignor Capozzelli came to Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Montclair.

Mr. Speaker, as pastor he has been a strong and guiding force of this outstanding parish. He established the parish council and numerous other societies. He has also served as a board member of the Pastoral Advisory Committee to the Archbishop, a member of the Archbishop's Annual Appeal and on the

Editorial Advisory Board of the Advocate. In addition, during his long and distinguished career, Monsignor Capozzelli has served as president of the Verona Chapter of Unico; as founder of the United States Association of Blind Athletes; as past president of the Montclair Lions Club; as State chairman of the New Jersey Blind Athletes Association and as president of the New Jersey chapter of the Cystinosis Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Capozzelli's devoted work to his parish and his community have earned him many notable honors, including the John W. Cressbaugh, Jr., Service Club Award; the First Annual Community Service Award of the Verona Chapter of Unico; the Township of Montclair's Outstanding Humanitarian Award; Humanitarian Award from the Commission of the Blind and Visually Impaired of the State of New Jersey, and Silver Life Membership Medal of the State of New Jersey Policemen's Benevolent Association.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present this brief profile of a distinguished man of God who has dedicated his life's purpose and fulfillment to helping others and guiding them in the pathway of life. The quality of his leadership is mirrored in the security and dignity that his parishioners have found in the comfort and aid he unselfishly and willingly gives to those who seek his helping hand and spiritual guidance.

Mr. Speaker, as Monsignor Capozzelli celebrates the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, I know that you and all of our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations for the excellence of his service to the church, our Nation, and all mankind. We do, indeed, salute an esteemed pastor, exemplary clergyman and great American—Msgr. Emmanuel M. Capozzelli, pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Montclair, N.J.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN IRAN

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the human rights situation in Iran is grim. The Government exercises its will through the intimidation, executions, and arrests of Iranian nationals.

According to the State Department, in 1988, at least several hundred political prisoners were executed and tortured. This is a conservative estimate, as there have been unofficial reports that at least 1,000 political executions took place during the last half of 1988.

The Iranian Government has reportedly used drug trafficking charges to mask political arrests and summary executions. According to the U.N. Human Rights Commission Special Representative, last year a large number of opponents to the regime were secretly and publicly hanged throughout Iran.

Trials by revolutionary courts are neither fair nor public. According to interviews of prisoners by the U.N. Special Representative, trials

lasted only a few minutes, none of the prisoners were given access to defense attorneys, there was no appeals process and some individuals were imprisoned beyond the limit of their original sentences.

Iranian citizens are deprived of the basic freedoms of speech, press, religion, travel and association. Newspapers are forbidden from criticizing the Government and Islamic principles, and all books must be submitted to the Government for censorship before they can be published. In addition, university course materials and class debates are monitored by Government informers, while professors must have a history of cooperation with the Government as a prerequisite to permanent employment.

The cries of torment from Iran should no longer go unheard. Leaders of the free world must take appropriate measures to publicly condemn these abuses against the people of Iran and to urge the new leadership to take a new look at its policies. I ask all Members of Congress to condemn the Iranian Government's past human rights violations, and urge the United States to continue its current trade restriction policy until these policies change.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON CONVENTIONAL ARMS REDUCTIONS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for cutting conventional forces that President Bush brought to the NATO summit in Brussels last week marks a dramatic turnaround from the hypercaution on arms control that marked the first 4 months of the administration. The Bush proposal should accelerate the negotiations, in part because it accepts the Soviet position that aircraft and overall military personnel levels be reduced along with tanks, armored personnel carriers, and artillery, and in part because the administration now seems committed to a rapid agreement. If the administration carries through on its pledge to hasten the talks, and the Soviets follow through on their own recent concessions and positive rhetoric, we may well achieve an agreement which sharply limits the Warsaw Pact threat of conventional attack. This would be an historic accomplishment.

According to a growing chorus of experts, conventional reductions in Europe could highlight a process of ending the cold war altogether. The opportunity derives mainly from the stunning reversals of Soviet policy in recent years—unilateral military reductions that will dramatically reduce their offensive military capabilities in Europe and Asia; acceptance of the basic framework of the NATO proposal in Vienna; the initiation of profound domestic reform, including vast improvements in human rights policies; and the acceptance, even encouragement, of substantial political and economic reform in Poland and Hungary. Because of these changes, we have the greatest chance since World War II of building

a more peaceful, cooperative relationship between East and West.

But although the administration has taken an important first step, it has yet to propose a more fundamental build-down of the NATO-Warsaw Pact military confrontation in Europe. Absent such a build-down, the United States will fail to reap the full benefits of ending the cold war. Most important, the Bush proposal would result in large financial savings for the Soviet Union, but almost none for this country, since it involves cutting only a tiny fraction of total U.S. military personnel and equipment. As State Department veteran Jack Mendelsohn, deputy director of the Arms Control Association, put it recently, "The Western alliance should not content itself with merely holding out the hope of perpetuating the confrontation in Central Europe at slightly reduced levels. It would certainly be to the benefit of the United States—as well as to Europe—to exploit the opening which Gorbachev has given the West and invite the Soviet Union to help us design a new security structure between East and West."

LEGISLATION CALLING FOR A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF DEEP MUTUAL REDUCTIONS

To take full advantage of the current opportunity, we must explore the possibility of reductions in the conventional forces of East and West more ambitious than those now proposed by NATO in Vienna. That is why the bill I am introducing today with Chairman ASPIN and Chairman MAVROULES is so important. This bill commends the President for his recent announcement of a conventional arms reduction initiative, and calls for a Presidential study of equal negotiated United States and Soviet conventional arms reductions of 25 and 50 percent below current NATO levels. Important military security issues are raised by a call for deep mutual reductions. As a result, many analysts urge extreme caution in moving to restructure the existing NATO defense posture. But caution should not mean paralysis. As former allied commander Gen. Andrew Goodpaster noted in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee in April, "Substantial force reductions below initial parity, if carefully conducted, * * * could be advantageous to the security of each side. The remaining strengths would of course have to be reliably verified. If such reductions are concentrated in force elements capable of deep-thrusting attacks * * * they could leave both sides still capable and confident of effective defense, without either one having the ability to attempt a sudden invasion."

Despite concerns about "force-to-space" ratios and maintaining forward defense, new work by analysts in Western Europe suggests that restructuring NATO forces to emphasize invulnerability and defensive operations will provide an extremely effective forward defense, even in the face of a massive armored attack. The Study Group on Alternative Security Policy [SAS] in West Germany, an influential group of active and retired military officers, diplomats, and civilian experts, has carried out persuasive studies demonstrating the efficacy of reconfigured ground forces. The SAS model emphasizes light infantry, smaller armored units, and extensive, decentralized networks of sensors, indirect firepower, and logistics. Clearly it seems plausible that a mutual

thinning out of the most attack-capable forces would enable us to mount robust defense with much smaller and less costly forces.

Many of the U.S. units earmarked for NATO use are based in the United States and thus not subject to the mandate of the Vienna negotiations. It is therefore imperative that we examine the requirement for these units in the context of deep reductions in the European theater. It may very well be the case that deep cuts in Europe on both sides would similarly enable us to scale back military forces at home. If not, the United States will lose all prospect of significant financial savings from conventional force cuts.

In calling for NATO-Warsaw Pact reductions to parity at 50 percent of current NATO levels, General Goodpaster proposed precisely the kind of study called for in this bill. The General said, "If we go down the road I have described, it will be necessary to devise new doctrine and new plans and new modes of employment and command. It's well within our capacity to do that. * * * But I hope that somewhere we would have some of our sharpest and smartest young officers sitting down and thinking this thing through afresh, devising military plans in light of the altered capabilities. It's high time that we got about that."

THE NEED FOR DEEP REDUCTIONS

The need for deep reductions in our military forces and spending seems clear. Politically, we face growing demands to reduce our military presence in Europe. Currently, we devote roughly half of our military spending to NATO, about \$150 billion each year. Our own citizens are less and less willing to continue this enormous expenditure on behalf of allies who spend less than us proportionately and have become serious economic competitors. According to the nonpartisan polling organization Americans Talk Security, the majority of Americans feel that economic competitors like Japan pose a stronger national security threat than military competitors, that we might seriously damage our economy by spending too much to defend other countries, and that economic power is just as important as military power.

In terms of the economy, our citizens are right. Not only have we allowed the national debt to grow to massive proportions, threatening future prosperity, we have also let a grave "investment deficit" accumulate. We now face massive unfunded needs in education, environment, health care, housing infrastructure, and other critical areas. Because military expenditures represent half of the discretionary (non-Social Security) Federal budget, we must reduce them significantly in order to put our domestic house back in order. If we want to avoid the well-trodden path of military overreach and economic decline so well analyzed by historian Paul Kennedy, we must shift more of our productive capacity to commercially productive ventures.

Deeper, defense-oriented reductions in NATO and Warsaw Pact forces are likely to signal a critical milestone on the path to a safer Europe and a less costly NATO defense. By exploring in depth the implications of such cuts now, we should be able to develop a more comprehensive agenda for European security that meets the challenges of

today's most pressing requirements—winding down the Soviet threat, enhancing economic competitiveness, and developing fairer alliance burden-sharing.

A TRIBUTE TO JAE MIN CHANG

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jae Min Chang. As president and publisher of the Korea Times since 1981, the newspaper has succeeded to match the significant growth and development of the Korean communities in the United States. Due to the effective leadership of Mr. Chang, the Korea Times is now the leading Korean language daily newspaper with the largest nationwide subscriber base and the largest advertising volume.

In 1970, Mr. Chang began his tenure at the paper as a staff reporter for the Korea Times, Seoul. Then, he served as president of Han Kook Trading Co. for 5 years. Since 1978, he has also served as a member of the board of directors of Hankook Ilbo and the Korea Times, in Seoul, the parent company of the Korea Times.

Mr. Chang has been recognized by several community and business organizations for his commitment to community service and civic accomplishments. Under his leadership, the Korea Times has actively supported and encouraged programs which benefit Korean-American youth, immigrant families, and the community in general.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting a man of fine character and strong leadership. We are thankful to Mr. Chang and wish him continued success for a bright and prosperous future!

HOUSE ETHICS REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 24, 1989, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This piece originally appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

HOUSE ETHICS REFORM

One of the priorities in the House this session is improving congressional standards of conduct. Members are concerned about repairing the tarnished image of the Congress, and a House task force has been set up to make recommendations. Some of the effort will be to revise specific provisions in the House ethics rules, such as tightening up vagueness in the gift rules and cutting back on honoraria accepted by Members. Important as such rules changes will be, I believe that several other kinds of efforts would be as important—or even more important—in improving overall congressional ethics.

First, we need to restructure the House Code of Official Conduct to make clear what is at the heart of it. House enforcement of the ethics rules seems to have gotten off track somewhat in recent years. We often get bogged down in "legalese" and technical discussions of narrow provisions in the rules and guidelines. For example, last session one of the Standards Committee's conclusions about a Member was that he violated House ethics standards both by arranging questionable personal trips and by using a telephone to do it. Perhaps in the legal world the use of a telephone in interstate trafficking makes a difference, but to say that phone use indicates a violation of basic House ethics norms shows how far we have strayed from the essence of the Code of Conduct. Our major focus should be on broad standards of good conduct—whether or not a particular action by a Member reflects credit or discredit on the House, as Rule 1 of the Code says.

We should restructure the Code—emphasizing first a few broad ethical precepts that form the heart of the Code, followed by examples of more specific rules of misconduct (such as gift and honoraria rules) which are not claimed to be an exhaustive list of every kind of conduct that would violate the basic precepts. The basic structure of the Code should make it clear to Members that their actions should conform to broad standards of good conduct, whether or not they may technically avoid some of the legalistic nuances of a specific rule.

Second, we should broaden our conception in the Code of what is involved in ethical conduct or public morality. Basically our focus has been on financial matters. Clearly this is important, but one gets the impression from looking at the 250-page House ethics manual that if you file your financial disclosure forms on time, don't convert campaign funds to personal use, and don't misuse the frank, then you are behaving in an ethically acceptable and moral way as a Member of Congress.

Yet such rules capture only a part of what is involved in legislative ethics. Many other kinds of actions by Members of Congress can undermine the basic perception of Americans in the integrity of government, such as when a Member greatly distorts his opponent's record, misleads constituents about his role in getting some legislation passed or case resolved, or denigrates the competence or value of government. Several basic ethical values and principles apply to those in public service, including honesty, integrity, promise-keeping, fairness, respect, excellence, accountability, and protection of public trust. Some of these could be worked into our Code of Official Conduct. The Code should contain not just various prohibitions but also some positive ideals that Members should be striving to attain.

Third, we need to greatly expand the efforts of the Standards Committee to try to head off possible cases of misconduct before they occur. That means intensifying the Committee's "preventive ethics" role. Possibilities include having Standards Committee staffers visit each Member and congressional office every session to let them know of the Committee's advisory role; holding more Committee briefings for Members and staff on key provisions of the Code and on the rationale behind the rules; and bringing to the Hill outside speakers on various ethics topics.

Fourth, we must improve the way members of the Standards Committee are treated. It is difficult to get Members of Con-

gress to serve on this rather thankless Committee, and once they are on it we pillory them for not acting as we would like in particular cases. A frequent defense by Members of Congress accused by the Committee is to charge the Committee with racism or political motives or incompetence. Often a Member will defend himself by attacking the Committee or the process which he himself approved when the Committee was set up at the beginning of the session. It is extremely important to be able to attract good and capable Members to serve on the Standards Committee, but that is getting increasingly more difficult to do.

Fifth, clear ethics signals need to come from the top. Reconstructing the House ethics rules and trying to close all the loopholes is important, but the overall tone set by our leadership is more important. Thus I strongly supported President Bush's effort to send the right ethics signal to government workers from the very start of his administration—announcing that the highest standards would be required and that even the perception of wrongdoing should be avoided. Speaker Wright and House Minority Leader Michel made strong statements in favor of House ethics earlier this year when they set up the task force on ethics reform. Restating that message frequently will make it clear to Members that they will be held to the highest standards of conduct.

Finally, we need to broaden bipartisan cooperation on House ethics. There is little doubt that much of the recent interest in ethics reform has been a thinly veiled desire to use the "ethics issue" to make partisan political attacks. Ethics should not be used as a tool for badgering our political opponents. My concern is that the cynical, partisan basis for some efforts to push ethics reform may in itself be bringing down the public's conception of government integrity. To be truly effective, government ethics must be approached in as nonpartisan a way as possible.

The vast majority of Members of Congress are honest, hardworking, dedicated individuals. Yet the misconduct of some can bring down the institution as a whole and undermine its ability to function. Reinforcing our standards of conduct is an effort worth undertaking.

STEPHEN VAIL MIDDLE SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM UNDEFEATED

HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge herein the accomplishments of the Stephen Vail Middle School basketball team in Middletown, OH. The team maintained an undefeated record of 16 and 0 through the entire season, and subsequently won the Jerry Lucas Invitational Basketball Tournament.

The accomplishments of the Stephen Vail Middle School are a reflection of all who are involved in the community. From the parents with their support, to the coaches with their guidance, all the way to the kids with their determination, the team effort they enlisted is evidence that working together yields prosperous results.

The Stephen Vail basketball team members are as follows: Joe Bailey, Deon Bailey, Ben Bremer, Matt Davidson, Andre Gann, Danny Hall, Matt Harrison, Juday Jameil, Tony Joseph, Chad Lane, David Moore, Jonathan Stitt, and Chad Walton. This group of winners were led to this undefeated season by their coach John Parks.

Let the record show that their accomplishment is well noted. It is truly an indication of the character of both the kids as well as the rest of the community.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL'S ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SINGLE PARENTS

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, June 14, 1989, an awards luncheon will be held in North Haven, CT, to honor the Private Industry Council's On-the-Job Training Program. Since the House will be in session that day, I will be unable to attend the luncheon. I am disappointed that I cannot be there in person to extend my congratulations to those being honored. They have all done fine jobs which deserve to be noted. I would, therefore, like to share with you a few words in praise of this successful program and the employers and participants who have made it so.

The concept of the On-the-Job Training Program is unique. A partnership between the private and public sectors, it attempts to redress the most stubborn obstacles to welfare mothers who want employment: lack of skills, lack of transportation, unavailable or inadequate child day care, and the risk of losing State-provided health care benefits. After a preemployment training program which counsels participants in areas such as attitude, punctuality and attendance, they are referred to the Winners Circle, an on-going support group that meets weekly to discuss any problems or concerns of single, working parents. They then work with a counselor to search for a job. Counseling and assistance are also available for day care, transportation, housing, health, and legal arrangements. The idea is to surround the participants with as much support as necessary to give them the confidence and tools to succeed on their own.

No employer would ever knowingly hire an employee who was unsuitable for the job. The On-the-Job Training Program participants are no exception and get no special favors. Ultimately, they are the ones who must land the job. But with the kind of support the program provides, and the reputation past participants have earned in the business community as dedicated employees, it is easy for a potential employer to overlook an applicant's initial lack of skills and to make an investment in their future.

Over the last 2 years that the program has been in full operation, 90 single parents have been placed into permanent full time employment. These are not hamburger flipping jobs,

but entry-level jobs with a future. The salaries are competitive, and all positions offer comprehensive medical benefits.

Mr. Speaker, programs like this which offer effective solutions to some of the country's most difficult problems deserve the full support of Congress. The Private Industry Council's On-the-Job Training Program has recently been funded for 3 additional years. The funds are definitely well used. In fact, the return is greater than the expense. For every AFDC recipient placed in a job, the taxpayers save \$12,000 in welfare payments per year.

My congratulations go out to all who have worked hard to make the program a success: the Private Industry Council, the State department of income maintenance, the State department of human resources, the city of New Haven Job Center, the New Haven Board of Education Career Service Office, and the employers and participants. Although, I will not be with them in person, I join them in celebrating their success.

CONGRESSIONAL CAPITOL MEMORIAL FOR CHICO MENDES

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, I joined 13 of my colleagues on the Capitol steps to honor Francisco "Chico" Mendes Filho, a Brazilian rubber tapper who was murdered on December 22, 1988. This memorial was sponsored by the Congressional Human Rights Caucus [CHRC], which I cochair with Representative TOM LANTOS, and the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agricultural Research and Environment. This subcommittee is chaired by Representative JAMES SCHEUER and the ranking member is Representative CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER.

I would like to thank the following Members for participating in this event: CHRC cochairman TOM LANTOS, CHRC executive committee members JACK BUECHNER, NANCY PELOSI, JAMES SCHEUER, and GERRY SIKORSKI, CHRC members CHUCK DOUGLAS, JIM MOODY, and CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, as well as Representatives RICHARD DURBIN, WALTER FAUNTROY, and DAVE McCURDY, and Senators AL GORE, JOHN HEINZ, ROBERT KASTEN, HARRY REID, and TIM WIRTH. I am confident that our continued efforts will ensure protection of the environment and the people of Brazil.

I urge my colleagues to read the following excerpts from statements made at the Congressional Capitol Memorial:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS

Chico Mendes was honored with the United States Global 500 award for his work to protect our environment and foster a secure future for all the inhabitants of the world. Today we honor and remember him for his struggle to expose human rights violations against thousands of people. Chico Mendes will always be remembered as an advocate to protect the world's ecological balance and as an advocate for the rights of workers and indigenous peoples. He exemplifies the struggle for the human rights of all men and for the preservation of natural resources that are basic to human survival.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES SCHEUER

Tropical deforestation is widely considered the worst threat to the world's wildlife. The loss of habitat which translates into reduced biological diversity has serious consequences for human welfare. Future development in the area of agriculture, medicine, and industry will be more difficult. The disruption of the ecosystem processes and functions is another important area of concern, for the reduction of biological diversity may accelerate the "greenhouse effect" which is warming the planet, with potential for disastrous droughts and sea-level rise in the next century.

Chico Mendes was cut down for his role in fighting for an environmentally and economically sound use of the rain forest. This death challenges us to take up his unfinished task, and to join together against the forces in Brazil and at home which would destroy the rain forest at the expense of the world.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK BUECHNER

We cannot restore life to Chico, or the many others who have been killed. If their deaths are to have any meaning it must come from those of us who recognize the senselessness of their loss, and the importance of the cause for which they died. How can this be accomplished?

If we can create a world in which the Chico Mendes' are not forced against the wall merely to survive—A world in which disputes are not settled by a shot fired from the shadows—A world in which progress is not predicated merely on change, but also understanding, then we will have succeeded.

If we create a world in which concern for human rights directs our actions rather than hinders them—A world in which strength is measured by what we can build, rather than destroy—then perhaps a greater meaning may yet be attached to his death. In a world such as this, Chico Mendes would still be alive.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

We are paying our respects to Chico Mendes for several important reasons.

First, to say to the world that lawless behavior that destroys another person's life, for whatever reason, has no place in civilized societies.

Second, to remind the world that freedom of expression and assembly are the touchstones of democracy, and must be upheld to the utmost, if the excesses and misdirections of public institutions are to be held accountable and corrected.

Third, to share with the world the wholesale destruction of irreplaceable plants and animal species, and the disregard for the rights of communities living in these forests, done not in the name of progress but of greed.

Chico Mendes lived in Brazil, but his actions were in the best interests of people throughout the world. We would be shirking from our responsibilities if we allowed this tragic incident to pass by without sending a resounding message to individuals everywhere that Chico Mendes of the world are paragons of citizen commitment who need our support.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DAVE McCURDY

It is estimated that 20 million acres of rain forest are burned each year in Brazil. This trend, if it continues, could lead to devastating changes in the global climate, such as the greenhouse effect, and cause the ir-

revocable loss of habitat for numerous species of plants and animals.

This joint resolution is an effort to commemorate the important work of one man—Chico Mendes—and to heighten the public's awareness about a problem of global concern.

I hope this resolution will foster more cooperation between the United States, our allies and the government of Brazil in finding ways to lessen the impact of the destruction of the Amazon basin.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WALTER FAUNTROY

Chico Mendes is one of those people you wish you had had a chance to meet. Out of a human cast of billions there are a precious few who, empowered by the conviction of justice, successfully challenge a more powerful, established order perpetuating injustice. Mendes was such a person. Rather than destroy his efforts to harmonize man and Amazonia, his killers have brought world attention to this cause. Sadly, it is an acuity of focus which would have been difficult to achieve had Mendes lived.

The responsibility for all of us now is to sustain the work and legacy Mendes left behind. The importance of preserving the Amazon rain forest is obvious. But the real beauty of what Mendes taught us is that people can successfully coexist and reap the bounty of the Amazon without destroying it.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN PORTER

This is the Congressional Capitol Memorial to honor Chico Mendes. I welcome you to it. Let me recognize Barbara Bramble, International Director of the National Wildlife Federation and Steve Schwartzman, Senior Associate of the Environmental Defense Fund, and thank them for planning today's activities.

I'm Congressman John Porter (R-IL), Co-Chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. The Caucus is sponsoring this Memorial together with the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agricultural Research and Environment. My Co-Chairman is Congressman Tom Lantos who although unable to be with us in person, is here in spirit.

Chico Mendes was one of the world's leaders for human rights and the environment. Three days before Christmas, he was fatally shot at point blank range in the remote Brazilian province of Acre.

We offer our condolences to Chico's wife Iizamar and their two small children. We meet today to pay tribute to a courageous man who told us many times that the cause he lived for—the environment and the rights of indigenous peoples—was also worth dying for.

Chico Mendes created and fostered a grassroots movement of rubber-tappers in Brazil, who protected tropical forests and used their resources in sustainable ways.

Chico developed the idea of "extractive reserves" that enabled rubber-tappers to harvest wild rubber from tropical forests in a non-destructive, economically viable manner.

As the leader of the union of rubber-tappers, Chico Mendes ran up against the large landowners who fostered destruction of the tropical forest. Chico survived five attempts on his life, but those opposed to sustainable development finally succeeded last month. Brazilian police have arrested several murder suspects, all members of a large family of cattle ranchers.

Chico's murder is not an isolated incident. Since 1980, over 1,000 labor leaders, landless peasants, journalists, politicians, environmentalists, and lawyers have been killed in rural areas of Brazil over land issues. The Congressional Human Rights Caucus is concerned that while the government's response to Chico's death has been strong, they have not stemmed the tide of murderers supporting destruction of the rain forests in Brazil.

We are sending a letter to President Jose Sarney respectfully to request that he ensure vigorous and public prosecution of all those responsible for this crime. We believe these actions will strengthen President Sarney's efforts to protect the Amazon rainforest and help deter further violence. Senator Bob Kasten (R-WI) is sending President Sarney a similar letter from the Senate.

Chico Mendes showed us that environmental protection in developing countries cannot be separated from the human rights of the people who live there. Chico's death will not end this struggle. To the contrary, his murderers have brought home to people everywhere what is happening to one of the world's most important resources—the tropical forests—and the people who live there and want to protect them. Chico Mendes gave his life to this cause.

To honor and continue his work, a coalition of environmental and human rights groups has created the Chico Mendes Foundation to develop more leaders like Chico, promote the extractive reserve principle for sustainable economic development, and work to protect tropical forests and indigenous people worldwide.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS R. BRUCE

HON. ENI F.H. FALOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. FALOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to pay tribute to a great American, Mr. Louis R. Bruce, who passed away last Saturday. A member of the Mohawk-Sioux Tribes, Mr. Bruce was born 83 years ago on an Indian reservation in New York. As a native American, he understood many of the problems faced by our first Americans and spent a lifetime addressing many of the problems that still confront American Indians today.

He served as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1969 to 1973. In this capacity, Mr. Bruce always stood up for the Indians at a time when the administration often chose to overlook many of their problems. As Commissioner, he instituted many of the programs designed to help the American Indian and was the primary force responsible for the return of the sacred Blue Lake area to the people of Taos Pueblo in New Mexico.

The passing of Mr. Louis R. Bruce is a great loss to all native Americans, but he leaves behind a legacy for which his family and all Americans can be proud.

LOUIS BRUCE, EX-COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, DIES AT 83

Louis R. Bruce, 83, the former commissioner of Indian Affairs and the president and chairman of the board of a Washington-based consulting firm specializing in Native American issues, died of cancer and heart ailments May 20 at Crystal City Nursing Center in Arlington.

Mr. Bruce was commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1969 to 1973, when he was fired after a six-day takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building at 19th Street and Constitution Avenue NW by about 500 protesting Indians.

His years as Indian Affairs commissioner coincided with a period of increased activism among young Indian staff members at the bureau, and Mr. Bruce was said to have encouraged the young activists, much to the displeasure of his superiors at the Department of the Interior.

After his dismissal, Mr. Bruce formed Native American Consultants Inc., a firm that specializes in the promotion of Indian involvement in national affairs and the provision of services to Indian organizations.

A resident of Arlington, he was born on the Onondaga Indian Reservation near Syracuse, N.Y. His father was a Mohawk and his mother an Oglala Sioux.

He graduated from Syracuse University, then operated a dairy farm, worked at a New York clothing store, served as education and youth director for the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association and worked in advertising and public relations in New York.

From 1959 to 1961, Mr. Bruce was special assistant commissioner for cooperative housing at the Federal Housing Administration in Washington. Later he was a public relations executive for a chain of cooperative supermarkets in New Jersey and executive director and chairman of the board of trustees of Zeta Psi Educational Foundation and Fraternity Inc. in New York.

He was a Mason and a member of the Cosmos Club, the National Press Club and the Capitol Hill Club.

Survivors include his wife, Anna Wikoff Bruce of Arlington; three children, Katherine Louise Huxtable and Donald Kenneth Bruce, both of Richfield Springs, N.Y., and Charles Wikoff Bruce of Las Cruces, N.M.; a sister, Noresta Cable of Iliion, N.Y., and eight grandchildren.

THE EFFECTS OF THE ESTATE-FREEZE RULES ON FAMILY-OWNED BUSINESSES

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in 1987, Congress included section 2036(c) in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act which changed the tax treatment of the estate-freeze rules for transferring family owned businesses from one generation to the next.

Prior to 1987, owners who wished to transfer their businesses to their heirs would allocate to preferred stock the current value of their businesses, the voting power and the income. Owners retained this stock and issued nonvoting common stock to their heirs to which was allocated future growth of the business. Upon the death of the owners, estate taxes would be due only on the value of the preferred stock not on the appreciation of the businesses since the freeze was undertaken. The appreciation value was attributable and taxable to the heirs.

Under the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, this process was fundamentally altered. Now, upon the death of the owners of a company,

taxes are due on the value of the preferred stock, as well as on the appreciation of the business.

These changes were designed to end abuses of the estate-freeze provision. This is entirely appropriate. However, the effects are more far-reaching than curing abuses of the Tax Code. It has made extremely more difficult the salutary American practice of handing on to heirs, for stewardship and expansion, a family-owned business.

One of my constituents and friends, Roy Hunt, president of Hunt Tractor, a construction-equipment sales company in Louisville, KY, has focused on problems presented by section 2036(c) to small, family-owned businesses. He is well-credentialed to discuss this issue because of his steady participation in the Small Business Council of the Louisville Chamber of Commerce and his election as a delegate to several White House Conferences on Small Business.

Whether one does or does not agree with his thesis—the pre-1986 estate-freeze provision should be restored—Roy's perspective and position are worth examining.

Therefore, I was pleased and proud to have come upon an article, appearing in the June issue of *Nation's Business*, discussing section 2036(c). It mentions prominently my constituent, Roy Hunt, and his son, Scott.

The article follows:

CONGRESS WARMS TO ESTATE FREEZE

(By Joan C. Szabo)

A move is underway in Congress to restore the estate-freeze approach for transferring family businesses from one generation to the next.

This legislative action results from widespread protests that elimination of the freeze method has jeopardized the ability of heirs to retain ownership of a family business.

Prior to its abolition in late 1987, the estate-freeze method was used in those family businesses that had achieved substantial success under a founder/owner. The procedure typically began with a recapitalization. Much of the current value, voting power, and income was allocated to preferred stock retained by the owner. The owner sold or gave nonvoting common stock to the heirs.

Growth of the business was allocated to the common stock and was not reflected in the owner's preferred shares. Estate taxes became due on the value of the preferred stock, which generally had not risen since the recapitalization. Without the freeze, estate taxes are calculated on the entire value of the business at time of death.

Those taxes can overwhelm the heirs: 37 percent on the value of an estate above \$600,000, increasing to 55 percent on amounts above \$3 million. The first \$600,000 is exempt. Estate taxes can be due as soon as nine months after a death.

The 1987 change, contained in Section 2036(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, essentially eliminates the use of the estate freeze as a technique to perpetuate family firms with minimal tax consequences.

Under Section 2036(c), the tax cost of transferring ownership of a family business is dramatically increased, says Ross W. Nager, head of the family-wealth-planning practice in the Houston office of Arthur Anderson & Co., an international accounting and consulting firm. Such an increase could

cause the sell-off of many family firms whose heirs would be unable to pay the excessively high estate taxes.

One family-business owner who says the tax-law change threatens the future of his company is Roy Hunt, 67, who owns Hunt Tractor, a construction equipment sales firm in Louisville, Ky. Founded by Hunt 46 years ago, the firm employs 55 people and has annual sales of \$14 million. He fears that after he and his wife have died, his son, Scott, and daughter, Judy, may have to sell the family firm to pay federal estate taxes if Section 2036(c) is not repealed. "Maybe that is what our Congress wants, but it is not what our economic system needs," he says, noting that family firms create jobs and foster business development.

Rep. Bill Archer, R-Texas, senior Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, has introduced legislation to repeal Section 2036(c) and restore the estate freeze as a tax-planning option. His bill, H.R. 60, has 54 cosponsors, and that number is expected to grow in coming weeks. In the Senate, Republican Steve Symms of Idaho has introduced a similar measure, S. 659.

"In addition to preserving continuity of the business," says Washington attorney Anthony J. Obadal, the estate-freeze approach "kept the older generation involved in the business and provided the older principal with a comfortable retirement income. The children benefited as the value of the common stock grew through their efforts."

But congressional tax drafters and Internal Revenue Service officials disapproved of the freeze method, and 2036(c) was enacted without congressional hearings or debate on the subject. The motivation behind the change, says Nager of Arthur Andersen, was "the perception that taxpayers were understating the value of the common stock at the time of the freeze [and] . . . not paying enough income or gift tax on the transfer of that stock." He says the Internal Revenue Service also believed it was unable to prevent such practices.

The American College of Probate Counsel says that the change "unfairly favors families whose wealth is represented by cash and marketable securities over those who own farms or small businesses."

Section 2036(c) affects any owner who holds at least a 10-percent interest in a business. If such an owner transfers a "disproportionately large share of the potential appreciation" of that firm to a family member, the market value of that share plus all future appreciation is taxable as part of the estate when the original owner dies.

The law defines a "disproportionately large share" as one that is greater than the share that is retained by the owner. The result is a large increase in estate taxes for family-owned businesses.

"Unfortunately, to catch a few abusers," says Rep. Archer, "Congress enacted virtually an entire new estate-tax system on top of the old one. This new one is ill-defined and potentially frightening in its reach." He says members of the tax-writing committees were never given an opportunity to consider less burdensome alternatives to Section 2036(c). "Instead of protecting family business, these rules create a bias in favor of breaking up the family business," he says.

Jack Miller, president of Quill Corp., in Lincolnshire, Ill., is another family-business owner who feels the effects of Section 2036(c). He started Quill in 1956, and it has grown into a \$250-million mail-order company selling office supplies. His brothers Harvey and Arnold later joined the business.

Jack Miller says he would like to give his children some of the company's non-voting stock—even if he has to pay gift tax on it. But under Section 2036(c), his attorney says, it is not clear whether his estate will be taxed for any appreciation of nonvoting stock he gives them unless he gives the children both voting and nonvoting stock in the same proportion in which he owns both types of stock. The effect of such a stock transfer would be to change the ownership balance of the company, he says. "My brothers and I want to maintain control, so we have been hung up for months on this stock transfer because of the far-reaching nature of Section 2036(c)."

In addition to its onerous impact on family firms, "the law was drafted broadly, encompassing nonfamily members, and may apply to certain transfers to employees or others," says Obadal. "For example, transfers for below market value of nonvoting stock to employees may conceivably be covered and consequently included in the principal's estate and taxed accordingly."

Thomas Brock, an accountant with the Longmont, Colo., firm of Brock, Buchholz & Stow, says, "Such an extended reach is typical of the recent direction Congress is taking, which is to try to tax small business out of existence." Brock, a member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Small Business Council, says, "Congress is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs."

David Bork, a family-business counselor in Aspen, Colo., says, "The provision is brutalizing the family-controlled business."

The U.S. Chamber and other groups, including the American Bar Association, strongly support the legislative repeal effort. "We believe that the estate-freeze rule is a disaster, and we want it repealed," says John Carson, attorney in the Tax Policy Center of the U.S. Chamber. He says the Archer bill is likely to make substantial progress this year. "Congress is receiving a lot of mail on the disastrous impact of Section 2036(c)."

Archer says: "We consider the prospects for passage good. We hope that H.R. 60 will be included in the budget-reconciliation measure which will be considered this summer by Congress. As we gain more and more cosponsors, the outlook for passage of this bipartisan measure increases."

Meanwhile, estate planners, tax specialists, and family-business owners await guidelines on Section 2036(c) from the Internal Revenue Service. They are expected to clarify the types of transfers affected by the elimination of the estate freeze.

Still, most opponents of Section 2036(c) believe repeal is the best way to clarify the dilemma for most family-business owners. Consultant Bork says that it is crucial for Congress to "make it possible for family businesses to pass on their companies more reasonably than the 1987 tax law provides."

**REPRESENTATIVE FEIGHAN
SPEAKS OUT ON ISRAEL'S
PEACE INITIATIVE**

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very enlightening and timely article written

by Representative ED FEIGHAN for the Plain Dealer.

I have had the good fortune of serving with Representative FEIGHAN on both the House Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees since our election to Congress in 1982. Although the gentleman from Ohio has proven to be an expert in many fields of Government, I have been most impressed with his insights into Middle East foreign policy issues.

The article printed below is a case in point. I urge my House colleagues, as well as officials in the White House and State Department, to give thorough consideration of Representative FEIGHAN's remarks:

NEGOTIATION CAN CHANGE MINDS

(By Edward F. Feighan)

On May 14, the Israeli government set forth its plan to end the intifada and achieve peace with the Palestinians and with Jordan. The plan's central component is an election in which the population of the West Bank and Gaza would choose representatives to negotiate with Israel over the short- and long-term status of the occupied areas.

The plan, although proposed by Likud Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, has the support of the Labor Party and represents the first consensus Israeli peace initiative since the days of Camp David, a decade ago. For that reason alone it merits serious consideration by the Arab world and the Bush administration.

It seems to be receiving it. Secretary of State James Baker struck exactly the right note when he said that the plan "gives us something to work with." Unfortunately, however, the reaction of the Palestinians has been negative.

Bassam Abu Sharif, a PLO spokesman and top aid to Yasser Arafat, says the plan's main problem is that it does not provide for any withdrawal of troops from the West Bank and Gaza before elections and negotiations. Other Palestinians in the territories and outside of them are saying the same thing.

There is only one thing wrong with that formulation. It stands Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 on their heads. Those resolutions envision Israeli withdrawal as a goal to be achieved in the context of negotiations—not as a precondition. After all, if withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza is the first step in the negotiating process, then what will be the last?

The Israeli plan, on the other hand, closely tracks both the Security Council resolutions and the Camp David peace treaty. It begins with elections that would be immediately followed by negotiations between Israel and the elected Palestinian representatives with the goal of establishing a five-year period of limited self-rule. No later than three years after self-rule has been achieved, negotiations would commence over the final status of the territories.

It is at this point, after the trial autonomy period, that the hard questions of territorial withdrawal and ultimate sovereignty would be addressed.

It is also at this point that the Palestinians and the Israelis can be expected to put forth their maximum demands. In an interview cited in the April 11 New York Times, Shamir indicated that he expected the Palestinians to demand a state during negotiations. "They can propose whatever they want," he said. But he added that "I have my views, I have my positions."

And we know what they are. He favors Israeli sovereignty over all of historic Israel, including the West Bank and Gaza. That is, very likely, the proposal he would place upon the table. Just as Palestinians will likely propose an independent state encompassing those same territories.

But, if recent history is any guide, these demands would just be for openers. Shamir realizes, as the Palestinians should, that in negotiations positions change. Accommodations are reached. Compromises are arrived at. That is what negotiations are for.

Former Prime Minister Menachem Begin swore, before the Camp David negotiations began, that he would never relinquish the Sinai air bases to Egypt. But once he saw that President Anwar Sadat was committed to peace, he agreed to give them up along with the rest of Sinai. In return, Israel received peace and recognition from Egypt—and a border that has been quiet for 10 years.

Similar things can happen again. That is why Israeli hawks like Ariel Sharon and David Levy are fighting their party leader's plan. They fear that the Shamir proposal may actually lead to the territorial compromise they refuse to contemplate. And it is also why Palestinians should reject PLO negativism and accept Israel's offer for elections followed by negotiations.

Because elections and negotiations can lead to results that no one can foresee—even peace between sworn enemies. More misery for both sides is the only outcome we can expect from a continuation of the status quo.

HEROISM DISPLAYED

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1988, three brothers from Buckner, MO, drowned when they fell through the ice on a pond near their home. Aaron Gragg fell through the ice, and in an attempt to save him from drowning, his brother Stephen was also submerged. Their brother Chad drowned while trying to save his two younger brothers. Chad and Stephen were awarded medals from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, in recognition of their bravery in attempting to save their brother. On May 19, I presided over the solemn occasion of awarding these medals to their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Gragg. I include the text of my remarks herewith:

REMARKS OF HON. IKE SKELTON

We are here today to honor a family for heroism displayed by two of their sons.

Shortly after I learned of the tragic news of the loss of Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Gragg of Buckner, Missouri, and the circumstances surrounding the occurrence of that loss, I brought the acts of Chad Eugene Gragg and Stephen Douglas Gragg to the attention of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. It is at the request of the Commission that I am here today to present these Carnegie Medals. The presentation is made here at this school at the request of Mrs. Gragg, because, in her words, you have "been so wonderful."

This Commission was established in 1904 by Andrew Carnegie to recognize outstanding acts of selfless heroism performed in the

U.S. and Canada. Recognition of acts considered worthy by the Commission consists of a medal, known as the Carnegie Medal.

To give you a better understanding of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission and why it was established, I'd like to have you think back with me for a few moments to January 25, 1904. For it was on that day that Allegheny County, Pennsylvania had its worst mine disaster. More than 180 miners died in a gas explosion at the Harwick Mine, near Cheswick.

Shortly after the explosion occurred, several men who had not been in the mine when the blast took place volunteered to go in and try to rescue any survivors. We know the name of only one of these men. He was Dan Lysle, and Dan went into the mine, even though he knew it was filled with deadly gas, and brought out one man—the only survivor of the explosion. But Dan did not stop there. He went further back into the mine to search for others, and it was then that he was overcome and killed by the poisonous gas fumes.

Well, that was of course a terrible tragedy, and one that brought extreme sorrow and suffering to the families of the miners who were killed, and certainly to the family of Dan who had a wife and four children. However, as sometimes happens with events of this type, there was something fine and worthwhile that grew out of it. For it was this tragic explosion more than any other thing that was responsible for the founding of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. Mr. Carnegie had thought for some time about honoring bravery, but it was Dan Lysle's heroic act that inspired him to carry out his plans.

Not more than two months after the explosion occurred the Commission was formed, and a trust fund was established. Furthermore, Mr. Carnegie specified that a medal be awarded to any man or woman, boy or girl who voluntarily risks his or her life to an extraordinary degree in saving, or attempting to save, the life of another. And it is the Commission management and members of the board of directors who study all the heroic acts that are reported and decide which ones qualify for awards.

Today, we honor the memory of two young men, schoolmates of yours, who attempted to save their brother Aaron, also your schoolmate, on February 4, 1988. I now read to you the citations of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission concerning the two medals I am about to present:

"Stephen Douglas Gragg died attempting to save Aaron Wayne Gragg from drowning. Buckner, Missouri, February 4, 1988. Aaron, 11, fell through the ice on a small pond and called for help. His brother, Stephen, 8, student, immediately ran onto the ice for him; nearing the hole, he slid into the open water and submerged. Another brother went onto the ice for the boys; he too broke through. Firemen arrived shortly and pulled the boys from the pond, but none of them could be revived.

"Chad Eugene Gragg died attempting to save Aaron Wayne Gragg and Stephen Douglas Gragg from drowning. Buchner, Missouri, February 4, 1988. When Aaron, 11, fell through the ice on a small pond and called for help, his brother, Stephen, 8, ran onto the ice for him, but he slid into the open water and submerged. Their brother, Chad, 12, student, immediately went onto the ice for the boys. Nearing them, he too broke through. Firemen arrived shortly and pulled the boys from the pond, but none of them could be revived."

Words or medals can in no way replace the irreparable loss to the Gragg family. However, the acts of heroism of Chad and Stephen will long be remembered. Their acts of heroism are being recalled and honored.

Heroism, we are sure, is not courage alone—it is not bravery alone. It includes some noble quality that permits the exercise of these virtues in defiance of the fundamental law of self-preservation. We find these words in the Bible, and they are fitting on this occasion:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (John 15:13)

On behalf of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, I present to the parents of Chad and Stephen Gragg these medals. They are truly young heroes as evidenced by their bold attempt to save their brother Aaron.

TOM H.J. BYUN

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom H.J. Byun. Mr. Tom H.J. Byun joined the Korea Times in Los Angeles as a staff reporter in 1978. He has written many articles concerning U.S. Government and politics, immigration and local community affairs.

His articles have provided a means of increased awareness and understanding of American life and culture.

He has been recognized by many community organizations, U.S. Government agencies, State legislators, and Members of Congress for his articles and commitment to community service. Mr. Byun's journalism experience began as a student reporter at Seoul National University in Seoul, Korea. He joined the editorial staff of the Pax Romana, otherwise known as the Korean Catholic Intellectual Movement Journal, published in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting a man of fine journalistic skill and integrity. We appreciate Mr. Byun's dedication and commitment to the Korea Times.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 31, 1989, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

For many Americans, the 1988 election campaign represented politics at its worst: the emphasis on image at the expense of substance, the dominance of negative advertising, the increasing importance of money, and the growing influence of political action committees (PACs). To restore public trust in government, the system of financing campaigns should be overhauled.

As campaigns employ more sophisticated techniques, their costs have risen dramatically. Successful campaigns frequently involve public-opinion polls, direct-mail appeals, and expensive television advertising. In 1976 the aggregate cost of campaigns for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives was \$155 million. By 1988 it was \$458 million. Expressed another way, the average cost of winning a House seat jumped from \$87,000 in 1976 to \$388,000 in 1988. Successful Senate candidates, who spent an average of \$609,000 in 1976, needed an average of \$3.7 million to win in 1988.

The increased spending has been fueled in part by the availability of contributions from special-interest PACs. From 600 in 1974, the number of federally registered committees has grown to more than 4,200. Nearly every major corporation, trade association, labor union, and lobbying group has formed a PAC to support sympathetic candidates. As the number of PACs has increased, the importance of contributions directly from individuals has declined.

The high cost of campaigns increases the dependence of candidates on special-interest groups for support and forces candidates to spend considerable time raising money instead of meeting with voters. And while PAC contributions have mushroomed, few challengers have benefitted. Political action committees are reluctant to support challengers because they are afraid of alienating incumbent Members of Congress. Incumbents build up huge treasuries to discourage potential opponents. As a result, elections have become less competitive and the public dialogue is diminished.

There is a growing belief that the flood of money is influencing not only the conduct of congressional campaigns but the behavior of Members after the election. Although the empirical evidence has not shown a connection between Members' voting records and the sources of their campaign funds, the public cannot be blamed for suspecting otherwise.

Although now widely criticized, our current campaign finance laws were intended to eliminate corruption and reduce the undue influence of money on the election process. Amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act in the 1970s were designed to reduce the role of wealthy individuals while legitimizing the proper role of interest groups through PACs. The Congress did this by narrowing the definition of PACs and setting a contribution limit of \$5,000 per candidate per election. Individual contributions were limited to \$1,000 per candidate per election.

One effort by the Congress to address growing campaign costs was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1976. The Court rejected mandatory limits imposed on overall spending by candidates and on expenditures from personal funds, calling the limits an unconstitutional restriction on freedom of speech. In response to this ruling, several Members of Congress have suggested that candidates be encouraged to abide by voluntary spending limits. One proposal would encourage compliance by providing public financing to a candidate any time his or her opponent exceeded the pre-determined spending guideline. Such a system would make it advantageous for both candidates to voluntarily limit spending. Since 1976 the U.S. has had public funding of presidential campaigns.

Yet such proposals have met serious roadblocks. Some Members of Congress are philosophically opposed to publicly funded

congressional campaigns, saying that tax dollars should not be used for political purposes. Many Republicans oppose spending limits because they might place challengers at a competitive disadvantage to better-known incumbents, and there are currently more incumbent Democrats than Republicans.

We should not let the stalemate over public funding prevent us from correcting abuses in the way campaigns are financed and conducted. One of the most promising proposals would encourage voluntary spending limits for House races by offering reduced postage rates and discounted broadcasting costs to candidates who accept spending limits. This approach would achieve the same goal as public financing but would be easier to administer and less costly to implement.

A variety of other reforms would also be helpful. We should dilute the importance of PACs by capping the amount of PAC contributions a candidate could accept per election cycle and by providing individual taxpayers a \$100 tax credit for donations to congressional candidates. We should ban "bundling" of checks by PACs, by which they solicit contributions from their members and send them collectively to a candidate to avoid the \$5,000 limit on PAC contributions. We should give closer scrutiny to "independent expenditures" by PACs. This money is used to support or oppose candidates, but because it is theoretically not coordinated with a candidate's organization, it is not subject to any federal campaign limits. We should also tighten up the way Members can use campaign funds and close the loophole that allows pre-1980 Members to convert leftover campaign funds to personal use after they leave office.

Campaign finance reform poses a difficult challenge for Members of Congress: how to limit the role of money in elections without giving themselves a built-in advantage or placing themselves at too much of a disadvantage. Lawmakers also must try to ensure fair competition in the political arena without limiting citizens' rights to support candidates of their choice. Yet reforming the system must be undertaken if we are to limit the disproportionate influence of special interests, encourage grassroots participation in the political process, and make sure that the Congress is the truly representative body the nation's founders intended.

A TRIBUTE TO THE GRAND MASTERS OF THE CONNECTICUT MASONIC GRAND LODGE

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to those men who have led the Connecticut Grand Lodge of Freemasons during its distinguished history, the Grand Masters. This Saturday, June 10, 1989, the Masons of Connecticut will celebrate Grand Masters day. I am disappointed that other business will keep me from joining them at the Wallingford Masonic Home and Hospital as they honor those who have led them so well.

This year marks the bicentennial of the Connecticut Grand Lodge, the oldest existing

Masonic Grand Lodge in the Western Hemisphere. As the country finishes celebrating the bicentennial of its constitution, the Masons of the Connecticut Grand Lodge will begin celebrating the 200th anniversary of their charter. Freemasonry in the United States can trace its history back to the same time as our country had its origins. In fact the father of our country, George Washington, 9 of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and 13 signers of the Constitution were Masons. Revolutionary War hero Maj. Gen. David Wooster is considered the father of Freemasonry in Connecticut.

What can be said about the Masons also applies to their Grand Masters. They are among the Nation's most highly respected organizations. They are renowned for their dedication and for their charitable devotions of time, energy, and finances for the benefit of needy people. The Masonic Home and Hospital where they will be gathering this Saturday is a prime example of the good work they do.

The Masonic Charity Foundation of Connecticut, the philanthropic arm of the Connecticut Grand Lodge, is also celebrating an important anniversary, its centennial. Begun simply as a relief fund for victims of the Chicago fire, it outlived that purpose and was incorporated as a foundation by the Connecticut General Assembly in 1989. At first, the foundation concerned itself primarily with relief efforts for the poor, widowed, and orphaned. However, the success of those efforts gave rise to the dream of creating a home. In 1895 the property was purchased, and the Masonic Home and Orphanage was founded on its present site in Wallingford. The home grew as the demands placed on it increased. Hospital wards were added in 1919 and 1926, and a chronic disease wing was built in 1963. The 1980's saw expansion with the addition of other locations, more beds at the home and hospital, a statewide outreach program, and a residential retirement community at the Wallingford facility. Today the foundation supports 568 licensed, long-term care beds at the home and hospital and 156 more at Ashlar of Newton.

The list of Freemasonry's achievements and contributions to society continues on and on, and I am sure it will keep growing. However, without the wise and visionary leadership of Grand Masters like Luke A. Lockwood, who initiated the fund in 1872, the list would not be quite as long. I wish the 1989 Grand Master, Gail Nelson Smith, success equal to that of his predecessors. He has a fine tradition to follow and uphold.

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my support for the Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews, coordinated by my colleagues JOHN MILLER and PETER KOSTMAYER, and sponsored by the Union of Council for Soviet Jews. Having participated for many years in the struggle for the freedom of Soviet Jews, I

am encouraged by recent strides that the Soviet Government has made toward promoting the human rights for refuseniks' families. Yet we cannot be satisfied with these initial steps. We must not rest until all of those who desire to leave are given permission to do so. Among the thousands of refuseniks who still await exit visas are Emmanuel and Judith Lurie of Moscow.

The Lurie family, including Judith's mother Rika, first applied for emigration from the Soviet Union back in 1979 in order to be reunited with their family in Israel. After being granted exit visas in January 1980, they completed all the necessary procedures required for leaving the country, including the purchase of airline tickets and the packing of their belongings. In addition, their children were taken out of school, and Emmanuel resigned from his job.

Five days before their departure, the Lurie's were informed by the OVIR [Office of Visas and Registration] that their exit visas, excluding Judith's mother, Rika, had been canceled due to reasons of state security in connection with Emmanuel's work in 1962-64 at a chemical plant. Rika was warned by the authorities that if she rejected this chance to leave she would not be given a future opportunity. After being subjected to many years of constant harassment from the KGB, Rika was forced into making the painful decision to leave her family and friends for safety in Israel. However, assurances were given that her family would be reallocated visas shortly.

In 1987, the Lurie's daughter, Anna, married David Schvartsman, whose family had also been denied exit visas since 1975. In 1988, they had a son, Daniel. In August of last year, the Schvartsman family, including David's parents, applied and were granted permission to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. This means that the Lurie's are currently separated not only from their mother but they are also forced to live apart from their daughter and grandchild.

Recently, Emmanuel Lurie inquired into the Ministry of Chemical Industry in order to determine the length of his secrecy period. He was informed that his secrecy would not be lifted for an indefinite period. It is my understanding that General Secretary Gorbachev has on previous occasions stated that "state secrecy" cannot be grounds for refusal after a person has been separated from such work for a period of 10 years. In the case of Emmanuel Lurie, his work at a chemical plant ended over 15 years ago. That fact, when coupled with the forced separation of his immediate family, should qualify him and his wife for an exit visa.

Mr. Speaker, for Mr. Gorbachev's statement to have any significance, the Soviet Government must grant the Luries permission to emigrate and be reunited with their loved ones. On behalf of the Luries and the thousands of Jews in the Soviet Union who also wish to emigrate, I urge my colleagues to join me in a call for the freedom of the Luries and all Jews who wish to leave from the U.S.S.R.

SALUTE TO RICHARD MOSBARGER

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, it was once said that man has only a thin layer of soil between himself and starvation. Today, Mr. LAGOMARSINO and I would like to pay tribute to a resident of Fillmore, CA, who has trained generations of students in the art of cultivating that thin layer of soil.

This Saturday, Richard Mosbarger will retire after 34 years of teaching agriculture to high school students, first in the Bay area, and since 1962 in his hometown of Fillmore. During that time, Mr. Mosbarger has been a State leader in helping to keep California No. 1 in agriculture.

His list of accomplishments are impressive. He helped establish an 80-acre model farm for agriculture students to learn on, has served for a quarter-century as an adviser to the Fillmore Future Farmers of America and was twice named as Fillmore's teacher of the year. He also was named Man of the Year by the local Chamber of Commerce.

Beyond his local accomplishments, he helped develop curriculum for State vocational agriculture, was honored as an outstanding teacher by the State Association of California Agriculture Teachers Association, and is a master teacher trainer for Cal Poly's agriculture teachers training program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mosbarger has left a legacy of excellence that will be enjoyed by students for years to come. Mr. LAGOMARSINO and I ask our colleagues to join us in honoring him, and in wishing him well upon his retirement.

KREGER TRUCK RENTING CO.: CELEBRATING 100 YEARS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Kreger Truck Renting Co., located in the Greenpoint section of my district, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year.

The streets of Williamsburg in Brooklyn were clogged with horses and wagons, the top tune of the day was "Oh Promise Me," and Benjamin Harrison was the new President of the United States when a young man named Abraham Kreger started hauling store fixtures in his horse-drawn wagon.

Family tradition has it that Abraham, a merchant, loaned his horse and wagon to a friend who was transporting a new store fixture. Williamsburg was a center for fixture manufacturers in those days, and the recent immigrant saw an opportunity to serve those manufacturers' transportation needs. The rest is history.

The founder turned the business over to his son, Alexander, in 1909 so that he could heed the call to go west, eventually settling in

Denver. Back in New York, Alexander continued the business as a horse and wagon firm until one day around 1920 when, Katie, the horse, died. Then, Alexander was persuaded by an autocar salesman to purchase a truck rather than another horse, and the firm moved into a new era.

"It had a two-cylinder engine, and I can still hear the distinctive chuga-chuga of that engine," Philip Kreger, Alexander's son, recalls.

Philip entered the firm in the early 1930's, briefly ran a finance company and later, the Overman Tire Co. as subsidiaries, before selling off these in 1940 to concentrate on the leasing business in partnership with his brother, Joseph.

Each of the brothers has had one son enter the business. Joseph's son, Charles, started "sweeping out the office in the 1950's when I was 5," and was officially hired in 1967 when he was old enough to secure student working papers. Philip's son, Alex, joined the firm in 1965 after graduating from the Wharton School, interrupting his career between 1966 and 1968 to serve a tour in the Coast Guard.

In 1973, Charles and Alex took over, assuring a smooth transition of control to the fourth generation. Today, the cousins share management responsibilities, with Alex in charge of administration, and Charles in charge of operations.

Philip proudly anticipates the coming year when his grandchildren will start working at Kreger Truck Renting.

"The fifth generation is warming up in the barn," he says.

Kreger Truck Renting, which employs over 45 of my constituents, is an important factor in the industry, leasing a fleet of trucks, from small vans to over-the-road tractor trailers, to over 90 New York area manufacturers, wholesalers, and distributors. The lessor has had relationships with many clients for over 40 years.

On this auspicious occasion, it gives me great pleasure to honor the Kreger Truck Renting Co. and to offer my best wishes for another 100 prosperous years for the company and for the Kreger family.

MEDAL TO HONOR COURAGEOUS VETERANS

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored, along with 54 of my colleagues, to introduce a bill to establish a congressional medal to commemorate the sacrifices made and service rendered to the United States by those veterans of the Armed Forces who defended Pearl Harbor and other military installations in Hawaii against attack by the Japanese on December 7, 1941.

With the support of the Department of Defense, the Secretary will determine those veterans who are eligible to receive the award. It is my sincere hope that the presentation of this well deserved medal will take place in time for the 50th anniversary of the attack on

Pearl Harbor. The events of that fateful day, December 7, 1941, served to unify our great Nation. It is appropriate that we honor these courageous veterans who defended our country on a day when our Nation remembers.

I urge my colleagues to support this commemorative medal and help pass this legislation in time for the 50th anniversary.

LEGISLATION TO BAN THE IMPORTATION OF TEAK WOOD AND FISH PRODUCTS ORIGINATING IN BURMA

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to ban the importation of teak wood and fish products originating in Burma. I believe a ban is necessary to prevent further financial subsidization of the current brutal Burmese military regime.

I also commend President Bush's decision to indefinitely suspend GSP trade benefits for Burma because it has failed to protect internationally recognized workers' rights. The bill I am introducing will have the same effect as the President's commendable decision: To further isolate the Burmese military regime until it commits itself to respecting human rights, political liberalization, and national reconciliation.

Last year the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the present regime's brutality and calling for restoration of Burmese democracy. That resolution, Senate Resolution 464, was adopted in the midst of widespread popular demonstrations calling for democracy, and in the aftermath of a brutal spree of murders of innocent, unarmed, and peaceful demonstrators by the Burmese Armed Forces. Although tentative steps to reform Burma's political system were taken after the Senate spoke, reform was short lived. On September 19, 1988, the Burmese Armed Forces began a massive and violent crackdown to suppress the voices of democracy in Burma. The crackdown left thousands dead and the military in full control of Burma's political apparatus.

Burma's terrible human rights record also made it the subject of a March 8, 1989, resolution adopted by the United Nations Human Rights Commission. I am pleased that our delegation was successful in overcoming the opposition of some of Burma's current economic partners to bring Burma's actions to the world's attention.

The carnage continues. Since September, thousands of refugees have fled to Burma's borders with Thailand, China, and India, where they settled under the protection of Burma's ethnic minority insurgents to form the alliance. The Burmese military has launched offensives against these positions, including forays into Thailand to attack the Insurgents from the rear. The attacks have been brutally carried out without regard for the presence of civilians.

In response to the September suppression of the democratic forces, the United States suspended aid to Burma. Japan and the Euro-

pean Community, Burma's largest aid donors, followed. Although Japan recently resumed some aid, Burma remains starved for cash. Its foreign debt is now \$5.3 billion, with a debt-servicing ratio approaching 100 percent.

Burma's prospect for reducing its foreign debt are slim. After 26 years of the "Burmese Way to Socialism" the economy is in shambles. Rice production has been stifled by unrealistic production quotas and low government prices, and annual rice exports have fallen from about 2 million tons in the 1950's and 1960's to 20,000 tons in 1988. Legal trade has for many years been supplanted by black market cross-border trading in consumer goods, precious stones, and teak. According to the Institute of Asian Studies in Bangkok, two-thirds of all goods imported into Burma in 1985 were smuggled from Thailand. The annual value of smuggled trade is estimated to be \$3 billion, or 40 percent of GNP.

To survive amid the economic carnage it has wreaked, the Burmese military junta is cynically selling off Burma's remaining resources: teak wood and fish. Regrettably, the junta's cynicism has found ready partners among Burma's neighbors. Many Thai companies and two Thai state enterprises have, with the cooperation of the Thai Government, signed concessions to cut millions of logs inside Burma. These agreements have coincided with the Thai Government's decision to forcibly repatriate dissident Burmese refugees. Firms from elsewhere, including Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, and Europe, have also reportedly participated in the Burmese teak bonanza.

In addition, at least 15 fishing concessions worth over \$17 million have gone to Japanese, Thai, Malaysian, Singaporean, Australian, and South Korean fishing companies.

The money from these concessions will not help ordinary Burmese. In fact, they will hurt the people of Burma both economically and politically. Already, 100 Burmese fishing boats are reportedly lying idle on the Andaman Sea coast because fishing rights have been sold to foreign interests. Rather, the profits will prolong the life of the current government and equip the Burmese military for yet more violence. Even the act of felling trees has military value, as the jungle trails cut by loggers will provide the Burmese army access to isolated jungle strongholds of the ethnic minority resistance.

Further, the Burmese military has undertaken an effort to invite foreign investors into Burma, but with an eye to earn money to maintain power, not to develop the Burmese economy. And the previous record of foreign economic investment in Burma is not encouraging. Until this year, the only joint venture the Burmese Government permitted with a foreign company was a small arms and ammunition plant run by the West German firm Fritz Werner. Despite Germany's suspension of aid to the Burmese regime, this plant still efficiently produces the weapons of death used by the Burmese military. It is long past the time when the German Government should have taken actions to stop all such assistance.

The massive Burmese logging concessions are all the more troublesome in light of the need to control deforestation. In 1900 there were 2.49 million square kilometers of virgin

forest in Southeast Asia, outside of Papua, New Guinea. Today, only 602,000 square kilometers remain. In a recent report, the Bangkok-based Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific concluded that "floods, mudslides, even earthquakes and droughts can be directly related to deforestation."

Last October, deforestation in Thailand caused floods that claimed the lives of at least 350 people. In January, the Thai Government banned all logging concessions within its borders. Whereupon Thai logging companies moved their operations across the border to Burma. Burma reportedly has 80 percent of the world's remaining teak reserves, but the Burmese military has no interest in protecting this resource or its environment: Its only concern is the money to stay in power. U Nu, Burma's last freely elected leader, says of this activity: "Our forests will disappear." Similarly, the Bangkok-based newspaper, the Nation, has expressed reservations about the environmental consciousness of Thai logging companies now racing into Burma:

Given their questionable record in Thailand, there appears little hope that these firms will adhere to the rules of "selective cutting" in our neighboring countries. The massive forest depletion in those countries will not only take their toll on those societies, but will also affect Thailand's already vulnerable environment in the long run."

Mr. Speaker, I must note that America has had nothing but admiration for Thailand's ever-increasing commitment to democracy. Our hope that Burma might some day enjoy democracy is strengthened by our knowledge that Thailand has already achieved it. Democracy has made Thailand prosperous, and prosperity has made it powerful. I hope and trust that it will use its power to support, not hinder, democratic forces in Southeast Asia.

In the meantime, the United States must do what it can to keep hard currency, and the guns that hard currency buys, from the Burmese military. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the swift passage of this legislation to ban importation of teak and fish products from Burma. The United States cannot reward the Burmese military by purchasing the resources it is stealing from its own people.

SUPPORT FOR BALTIC INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, the people of Lithuania commemorated the 71st anniversary of their independence with demonstrations calling for greater autonomy and individual freedoms. I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in support for the Lithuanian people in this recent quest for fundamental human rights.

When the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, it marked the end of a century long domination over their

sovereignty by Russia. Constitutionally guaranteed freedoms were established in 1922 setting in place a democratic society based on respect for civil liberties. However, this freedom was short lived. As a result of a 1940 secret agreement between Stalin and Nazi Germany, Soviet forces occupied Lithuania. The Soviets clearly violated a 1920 peace treaty when they annexed Lithuania—a move that has never been formally recognized by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, continual repression of their religion, their culture, and their language has not stemmed the desire for freedom within the hearts of 3.6 million inhabitants of Lithuania. Although their recent quest for freedom did not survive, the quest for fundamental liberties like all other struggles is unquenchable and will continue until each individual is guaranteed basic respect for their own choices in life. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, as well as the people of Latvia and Estonia, who through their demonstrations remind the entire world that it is necessary to stand up to repression in order to fight for such a righteous cause as basic human rights.

STOP DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will help to protect victims of one of the most reprehensible, yet least understood crimes, that of spouse abuse. Spouse abuse takes many ugly forms. Unfortunately, the beating and intimidation, the threats and the humiliation often go unnoticed because domestic violence is usually carried out behind closed doors.

My bill specifically addressed the plight of those who as citizens of another country have married an American only to become the target of physical or mental cruelty. Last year a case came to my attention that both broke my heart and made me very angry. A Haitian woman who had recently married an American had become the victim of domestic violence. Her husband was physically abusive. She was terrified to tell anyone about it and was at a loss as to what to do about her situation. She finally mustered the courage to talk to a friend, only to discover that the law does not provide any clear protection for someone in her predicament. The ambiguity of the law can trap a spouse in an abusive situation for up to 2 years. Even at the end of the 2 years the fate of the battered spouse is still firmly in the hands of the abuser.

The bill which I am introducing will clarify the present statute to protect those who abandoned their own countries to build a new life in the United States only to become victims of harassment or physical abuse. I hope all my colleagues will join me in this effort to end domestic violence.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION—75 YEARS OLD

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week the Cooperative Extension Service is celebrating the 75th anniversary of the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. This landmark legislation which was enacted in 1914, established on a national basis the agricultural extension system. This system, which later was named the Cooperative Extension Service, has played a major role in the economy of the Nation and the State of California. As our society has changed, so has cooperative extension. While still offering excellent information to agricultural producers, cooperative extension also provides services to the poor, the young, and the elderly, in rural, suburban, and urban areas.

In California, our Cooperative Extension Service has grown with the State's needs. It has a strong focus in the various areas of agricultural production. It has helped the food and agriculture industry to lead all sectors in the State and has helped California agriculture become a national leader. Extension personnel perform a number of valuable services and our State extension system is one of the most innovative in the country. We are leaders in the use of integrated pest management [IPM] thanks to our Cooperative Extension Service. The use of computers, sophisticated irrigation systems, and the rest of the advances which we view as commonplace in our State are all the result of the hard work performed by extension personnel.

But cooperative extension is not just limited to helping the State's farmers and ranchers. The 4-H youth programs have helped generations of young people learn skills and values that have served them throughout their lives. The entire family is helped by the programs which home economists bring to help homemakers. The low-income populations are served by extension's Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program [EFNEP] which helps low-income families get the most nutritious food from their shopping dollar. In urban and suburban areas, extension has shifted its role to help our urban gardeners and throughout the State gardening skills are learned through the master gardening programs.

The Cooperative Extension Service programs extend into nearly every community in the State and we tend to take for granted the services which are provided. "If you have a problem you just call the county extension office." How many times have we all heard that? It is fitting that California has designated this week as Cooperative Extension Week, so that we can recognize the hard-working men and women who provide the services upon which we have come to depend.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to work with the Cooperative Extension Service, in my role on the Agriculture Committee and as an ordinary person who has called upon them for advice. And I am glad to have this opportunity to thank the Cooperative Extension

June 7, 1989

Service people publicly. Happy 75th birthday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN MARTIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my regret at having been unable to join my colleagues yesterday in support of House Concurrent Resolution 136, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to the movement for democracy in China.

Like all Americans I have been inspired by the determination and courage shown over the past several weeks by students in the People's Republic of China. The decision of the Chinese Government to react in so shocking and brutal a manner to their calls for greater freedom and democracy in the People's Republic is indeed deplorable. The aspirations and the ideals which Chinese students the world over have expressed cannot be crushed by force. The government in Beijing can bring only discredit to itself by allowing the brutality to continue.

FISH ANNUAL SURVEY FINDS ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY MAIN CONCERNS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to release the results of my annual constituent survey, which finds a clear consensus for environmental cleanup and definite positions on economic issues. My constituents have strong opinions over the need for action to clean up the environment, and on taxation.

More than 90 percent of those responding called for a strong national policy to promote recycling and use of biodegradable products—even if this results in increased costs to business, consumers, or local government. Also, 88.3 percent called for tougher air quality standards, emissions controls, and changes in gas mileage levels to combat ozone pollution.

Mid-Hudson residents were equally decisive in their responses to questions impacting on the economy and their own pocketbooks. On the controversy over State and local sales taxes on mail order sales, 66.3 percent opposed congressional legislation requiring these tax collections. While another 53.0 percent expressed opposition to proposals on value added taxes. On a related tax question, 64.0 percent checked off their opposition to Federal increases in the gasoline tax.

Residents of the 21st district came out strongly for tax reductions on capital gains; 63.7 percent said they were in favor of reducing the tax on long-term capital gains to encourage longer-term business investment and planning. A decisive 70 percent majority ex-

pressed support for legislative limitations on hostile takeovers and leveraged buyouts.

A plurality, 47.7 percent, favored the Bush proposal raising the minimum wage, coupled with a subminimum youth or training wage. Of those responding, 23.4 percent said no—instead expand earned income tax credit for low-income workers. While another 28.9 percent favored a minimum wage increase without a differential wage.

Residents of the 21st district strongly rejected proposals that legalization of drugs is a way to take profits out of drug-related crime and reduce the level of violence of the war on drugs; 67.5 percent said they opposed legalization, while only 21.3 percent supported the idea; 11.2 percent registered no clear position; 68.4 percent of those responding expressed personal concern over drug abuse.

On the issue of campaign reform, 55.9 percent responding favored limiting contributions by political action committees (PACs) and initiating congressional campaign financing with public funds; 34.2 percent said they were opposed; while another 9.8 percent were undecided.

On the subject of Congress creating a citizens corps of volunteers—civilian and military—who would be paid in education, vocational training, or home purchase vouchers, 51.9 percent favored the concept, and 26.2 percent said they were opposed. Another 21.9 percent were undecided.

In the foreign policy area, 84.1 percent of those constituents responding said they favored continuation of the United States dialog with the PLO now that Chairman Yasser Arafat has recognized Israel's right to exist and renounced terrorism.

The response to these surveys, which I conduct each year, is enormously helpful to me in learning what my constituents think on a range of domestic and foreign policy issues. My votes are based on my constituents' views as to the best interests of the district and the Nation. This year the number of respondents was at a record high. I and my staff appreciate the efforts made to give us a complete and detailed response in many cases, to the survey questionnaire.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House during proceedings on Tuesday, June 6. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 72 (approval of the Journal); "no" (MICHEL) on rollcall No. 73 (election of the Speaker); "yes" on rollcall No. 74 (semiconductor agreement, House Resolution 146); "no" on rollcall No. 75 (water resources authorization, H.R. 1101); "yes" on rollcall No. 76 (democracy in China, House Concurrent Resolution 136).

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the U.S. Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, it is my pleasure to join my caucus colleagues, in introducing a resolution that declares the week beginning May 13, 1990, as "National Tourism Week."

This resolution is an important way to applaud the commendable efforts of an industry that is vitally important, not only to my own State of Florida's economic, social, and cultural well-being, but to that of the Nation. The tourism community includes millions of workers in hotels, entertainment, amusement parks, recreation, transportation, restaurants, and other tourist-related enterprises. Their collective businesses and workers make a valuable contribution to the welfare of this country. This year a record number of international visitors are expected to invade the United States. We can expect 35.8 million visitors from overseas which is 2 million more than we received in 1988.

We welcome those people from other nations because we believe international travelers and our U.S. citizens benefit tremendously from the educational and cultural enlightenment of a travel experience. Tourism is vital to our way of life, to the understanding, and to the friendship among people of many lands. To pay tribute to tourism and all its educational, economic, and recreational benefits, I introduce for the sixth consecutive year a bill commemorating National Tourism Week 1990.

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. Coughlin. Mr. Speaker, this has been one of the most historic weeks I have experienced in more than 20 years in the Congress of the United States.

In these United States, we once again witnessed a peaceful transition of power. We elected a new Speaker of the House of Representatives—the third most powerful position in the United States. As in Watergate, our Constitution and our system provided for an orderly succession and—equally important—reflected the collective instincts of the American people.

The charges brought against the former Speaker were far from mindless cannibalism. The House Ethics Committee's call to investigate these matters was bipartisan and reflected the public view that Speaker WRIGHT had stepped over the line of propriety. I must say that Committee Chairman JULIAN DIXON, whom I sat beside for years in my capacity as the former ranking Republican on the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, is a man of great integrity, and is, in my opinion, one of the fairest individuals serving in the Congress.

While these events transpired here, nations around the world were trying to cope with the chaos created by systems that do not provide for peaceful transitions or reflect the people's will. Compare the situation in the United States to the crises now taking place around the globe.

Dramatic change has occurred in the Soviet Union with the advent of Glasnost and Perestroika. Yet without enduring precepts like those embodied in our noble Constitution, it remains unclear how the disparate peoples of that unhappy union can forge a common will. Just this week, scores were killed in new ethnic strife in Uzbekistan. The peoples of the Baltic states, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Central Asia, and elsewhere all press for their rights as the bureaucratic vestiges of totalitarianism resist.

Meanwhile, our hearts go out to the students and workers of Beijing, who, with uncompromising bravery, put themselves in harm's way in the interest of freedom and responsive government. The rule of Deng Xiaoping has been thoroughly discredited by the true popular sentiment of the Chinese populace.

Along these lines, I would note my view that old China-hand George Bush has handled the United States response exactly correctly by taking decisive action but refusing to be stymied until the smoke clears.

In Poland, where voters just participated in the most democratic elections since World War II, freedom is also seeking its legs. The government of General Jaruzelski has finally realized what the Chinese leadership apparently does not yet know: The will of the people cannot be suppressed forever. Next door in Hungary, this message has also been received.

Elsewhere, the Ayatollah Khomeini, nemesis of Democratic and Republican Administrations alike, has died, opening possibilities of new movement in United States-Iranian relations. The future of theocracy in Iran is unclear, but it remains dubious in the long-term without Khomeini at the helm. As events unfold, the possibility of obtaining the release of American hostages in Lebanon may be enhanced. Though Iran will likely experience turbulence as leaders of the various factions vie for supremacy, I think new opportunities for stability in the region will face the United States in the days ahead.

Finally, as we look south, the increasingly democratic body of nations in Latin America, working in partnership with the United States through the Organization of American States, strives for a democratic solution in Panama.

As we ponder these events occurring around the world, it is most useful to reflect on the model of government that the United States has provided to the world for two centuries now. Our Nation was blessed with forefathers who, experienced in the deprivations of tyranny, had the wisdom to ensure the embodiment of the will of the people in our guiding documents—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The great American experiment in democracy was a success, and remains successful today, because it has always recognized that governments are subservient to the

will of the people. In the long run, only the will of the people endures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1989, I was attending a funeral service at the Washington Cathedral for a close friend of many years.

As a result, I arrived back at the House floor just after the voting time expired on H.R. 2392, to amend section 37 of the Mineral Leasing Act, relating to shale claims.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted yes on this measure.

NEW JERSEY PRIDE HONOR ROLL—EDUCATION

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride that today I wish to recognize a New Jersey citizen who has, over the last 33 years, displayed a genuine care and concern for education in the State of New Jersey.

I am speaking of Mr. George A. Snow, who will soon be retiring from his position as Morris County Superintendent of Schools after 14 years. Residents of New Jersey, not simply Morris County, are indebted to Mr. Snow for the success he has had in promoting quality education within our State.

Mr. Snow received a bachelor of science degree in business education from Rider College in 1956 and earned his master of science in secondary education from Rutgers University 6 years later. He earned both initial and secondary principal's certifications from Newark State College and Rutgers University respectively. In 1956 he earned an administrator's certification from Newark State.

Working for the New Jersey State Department of Education, Mr. Snow served as coordinator of the office of adult basic education from 1969 to 1975. From 1975 to the present he was the Morris County Superintendent of Schools. Prior to working for the State Department of Education, Mr. Snow worked in the Asbury Park School System for 12 years.

The list of awards Mr. Snow has received over the years is long and illustrious. The Council of County Colleges of New Jersey 10-Year Award in 1989 and the Morris County Association of Elementary and Middle School Administrators Outstanding Service Award in 1988 give you some idea as to the quality of leadership George Snow brought to the State Department of Education. In addition, he serves on numerous committees and boards, inside and outside of New Jersey.

Mr. Snow is also an active member in the community. He is a member of the Corporation of the United Ways of Morris County and the Morris County Cancer Society, chairing their Great American Smoke Out in 1986.

George Snow is undoubtedly deserving of such high praise. He made it his duty to advance the educational system of New Jersey and has done an admirable job. His wife and four children, as well as people all over New Jersey, should be very proud of George A. Snow.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of people all over New Jersey and the 11th district, I ask for your recognition for the accomplishments of Mr. George A. Snow, a member of my New Jersey Pride Honor Roll.

SALUTE TO NEWARKS OF THE WORLD

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend, my home city of Newark, NJ, is proud to host an event that will draw together people from all over the United States and the world who share a geographical bond. All hail from locations called Newark.

The Newark of the World Reunion will be attended by over 50 officials from over a dozen Newark. Our community is excited about the opportunity to show visitors our city and to get acquainted with our counterparts from far and wide.

Newark, NJ, boasts an interesting history and a vision for the future. Founded in 1666 by Robert Treat, it is the third oldest city in the United States. George Washington camped in Newark during the American Revolution. Two of our Newark churches were founded before the Revolution. Between the years of 1747 and 1756, Newark was the home of Princeton University. Two prominent companies were established in Newark in the 1800's—Mutual Benefit Life Insurance, in 1845, and the Prudential Insurance Co., in 1875. Newark's renowned citizens include Aaron Burr, the third Vice President of the United States, and the gifted novelist Stephen Crane.

Today, we are engaged in a number of exciting economic development projects, including construction of the new Martin Luther King Courthouse, Seton Hall Law Center, the Legal and Communications Center, the condominium development of Society Hill, and a new hazardous waste research center to be operated by New Jersey Institute of Technology and four other State schools.

Among the many diverse cities, towns, and provinces that share our name are Newark, GA; Newark, VT; Newark, WI; Newark, ON, Canada; Newark-on-Trent, England; Newark, South Africa; and Newark, Australia. While each is unique, we all share common hopes and challenges as we enter a new decade together.

In Newark, NJ, we are looking forward with enthusiasm to exchanging ideas and information with our visitors during the Newark of the World Reunion. I know it will be a weekend of fellowship, discovery, and the beginning of new friendships.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives will

join me in extending very best wishes to all of the participants in the Newark of the World Reunion.

SPIRIT OF AMERICA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Army annually presents a military pageant that has been widely acclaimed and is known as the Spirit of America. It is an entertaining and patriotic 2-hour show of drills, music, and historical vignettes that matches any show of its kind in the world. I encourage my colleagues and their families to attend a reception and special Spirit of America performance sponsored by the Secretary of the Army, John O. Marsh, Jr., the longest serving Secretary of the Army in our Nation's history. The performance is on Thursday, June 15, at 8 p.m., preceded by a reception at 6:45 p.m., in the Capital Club, Capital Centre, Landover, MD.

To assist you in attending, transportation will be provided from the Rayburn House Office Building, and return immediately following the program. If you are unable to attend the Thursday night performance, you are welcome to attend any of the other performances. There will be evening performances at 8 p.m., Wednesday, June 14 through Saturday, June 17, and matinee performances at 2 p.m. on Saturday, June 17 and Sunday, June 18. I strongly urge you to make time to attend this most patriotic event, meet with the senior leadership of the Army, and our former colleague, Secretary Marsh.

SENTIMENTS OF FREEDOM

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it is important that we Americans pause and reflect on the individual freedoms upon which this country was founded. Too often, we take for granted our fundamental rights which millions of oppressed and persecuted people around the world can only hope for. For this reason, I am including in the RECORD a letter written by former refusenik Alexander Yampolsky. I feel that his words speak for the thousands of others who cherish the fact that our democratic society allows its citizens to live their lives according to their own will:

DEAR MR. PORTER: I am writing you this letter from Israel, that country I always dreamt to live. And, at last, thus my dream became a reality. On March 12, we had arrived to Ben Gurion airport. So, my long and hard fighting, my 16 years persistent efforts brought long-hoped results. This victory, I am sure, got possible not only because of my efforts, but also thanks to solidarity and all kinds of support I had from my friends abroad.

You know that for many years since 1974, I received a great moral help from many

residents in your district. It is impossible to express by words (especially in my bad English) how important and encouraging their devoted friendship was for me during all those so not easy years of my struggle. As well as I they, too, did everything possible to help me to break up that deaf and powerful wall of really unprecedented on its obstinacy, refusal.

They also asked you, dear John, to join them in their efforts and the fact is that you, practically from the first months of your job at the Capitol Hill, became a very active participant of the struggle in my behalf.

Your role in the united efforts was exclusively important and had a great meaning. I definitely know that you always used any possibility to mention about my concrete case on any occasion you had. You are one of the most famous and influential members of the House. And the Soviets, I think, couldn't ignore, your principal, tough and consistent position and attitude to the matter of my refusal.

I remember very well our meetings in Moscow and Leningrad last November. My wife and I were very moved by your care and cordial, sincere warmth. Thank you very much for everything you did for us for so long period of time.

If I ever have an opportunity to express my gratitude to you personally and publically, I will do this with pleasure.

Please give all the best to your nice wife. We also send our warmest greetings and deepest gratitude to your colleagues and friends in the Congress whose help in our case was also very significant: to Mr. S. Yates, P. Henry, S. Hoyer and Sen. D. DeConcini, Sen. P. Simon, and all others who work so hard to help to realize human and civil rights of the people in the countries where those rights are violated.

Best wishes to your constituents including my friends from Am Yisrael Congregation headed by Rabbi W. Frankel. Shalom.

Sincerely yours,

SASHA AND IRINIA YAMPOLSKY.

THE KROLS CELEBRATE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of this Congress two exemplary citizens from my district, Joseph and Helen Krol. This Saturday, the Krols will celebrate the 50th anniversary of their wedding day.

Mr. and Mrs. Krol were married at Saint Rose of Lima Church in the great city of Chicago on June 10, 1939. Their marriage is a tribute to the strength of the American family, and I am sure that my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Krols, their three sons and four grandchildren on this joyous occasion.

A TRIBUTE TO FATHER COONEY

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every community should be so fortunate to have a person like Father Michael Cooney working on its behalf. I know, from speaking with mutual friends, that he has contributed a great deal to the world, including the community of Chino in southern California, through his abiding faith. On June 11, he will be honored as he celebrates his 50th anniversary of entering into the priesthood. Joining him in this celebration will be his sister, Mary Cooney of Dublin, Ireland, and his niece, Winifred.

The achievements of Father Cooney, known as "Big Mike" among his friends, are well established and certainly worthy of recognition. He began his life in Ireland; born in 1915, he was educated in local schools and later at St. Flannan's College, Ennis. He entered St. Patrick's Seminary, Carlow, in 1933 and was ordained to the priesthood 50 years ago, in June, 1939. He came to the San Diego diocese the following September where he served until volunteering for military service.

As a chaplain in the U.S. Army during World War II, Father Cooney provided men and women hope and strength at a critical time in our Nation's history. Following the war, he committed over 30 years of his life to providing support and counsel to a group most in need—those incarcerated at the Chino's Men's Prison. Today, his continued commitment to celebrating weekly Masses for those in residence at two Upland convalescent homes, his work at St. Anthony's, and service as vicar of the retired priests of the San Bernardino diocese provides inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, as Father Cooney celebrates this important occasion with his friends and family, I want to extend to him my sincere thanks and appreciation for his selfless contributions. I want to let him know that many of us recognize Father Michael Cooney for all that he has been—and continues to be—to our community and our country.

CHINA'S LEADERSHIP LIVES IN THE PAST

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, China's leadership has now proven to the world that it lives in the past. With the horrific suppression of the student demonstrations on the bloody Sunday morning of June 4, the leadership showed once again that it lives in the shadow of the nation's violent past. Deng Xiao Ping no doubt remembers another generation of young people, who, caught up in the passions of Chairman Mao's Great Cultural Revolution condemned him and crippled his son by throwing him out a window.

Deng seems to have conveniently forgotten that it is he himself who launched the country

into a period of economic reform. He himself has acknowledged that the process of change is never smooth and yet now refuses to face the results of that change. Instead, he is reacting fearfully and has gathered about him the living relics of the Long March, who, schooled in the violent theology of wartime have now committed a government's ultimate crime—turning its weapons against its own people.

The tragedy is that the demonstrations were initiated by issues the Communist Party itself denounced as problems. Corruption in government damages the economy. Inflation, while relatively modest by developing country standards, is high. The fact that a doctorate is worth less in terms of salary than a peasant's tools surely grates in a nation that reveres scholarship. In any society as complex as China's it is only natural that people would express their concerns about these problems in a multitude of ways.

The student demonstrations were remarkable in that they were nonviolent in nature. Underneath the banners and bullhorns was a peaceful and restrained mass of tens of thousands. These young people truly proved that they are committed to China's future. By their peaceful protest they showed all of us that they hoped China was ready to move beyond the stage where "political power grows from a barrel of a gun."

We are deeply affected by the bloodshed because it represents the dashing of our own hopes. I think we were all charmed by the innocence and good faith of the student's message. We were flattered by their desire for democracy, the backbone of our own society. And for a brief moment we dared to hope that the Chinese government could rise above its own history and accept the demonstrations for what they were—a gesture of good faith by the young people who will carry the nation into the future.

But the government did what governments so often do and mistook criticism for a threat. By using violence it has undoubtedly invited violence upon itself. In assuming that it was all-powerful it has only accentuated the regional allegiances that divide the nation's politics. It has crushed a desire for positive change and in the ashes has planted the seeds of its own destruction.

I cannot imagine why a government which has pitched the last 10 years of its diplomatic policy on its the illusion of its own stability and desire for peaceful reconciliation would, at the merest of provocations use exactly the sort of destructive violence that it has denounced so often in other countries. How must the people in Hong Kong feel, a colony of refugees from the Chinese Communists who have reluctantly accepted the terms of the 1997 agreement? What about the people of Macau, themselves scheduled for repatriation in 1999? China has directed much energy toward an eventual reunification with Taiwan but I have a feeling it has now undermined any progress made.

These are issues that will be debated for a long time to come. Unfortunately no debate will do anything for the several hundred who died in the streets of Beijing or ironically, at the Gate of Heavenly Peace—Tiananmen Square.

We cannot support the bloodshed and we cannot support the means that cause it. I therefore support the suspension of military aid to China and the reevaluation of our relationship which must follow. I also agree with the administration's policy of extending the visas of Chinese students studying in the United States until hostilities subside. There is no doubt that our relationship cannot continue as before but cutting trade relations would do more harm than good. We have taken the steps we need to establish our position. Now we can only hope that reason will prevail.

**TRIBUTE TO MCKINLEY
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the great achievements that the McKinley Elementary School of Willoughby, OH, has accomplished. The McKinley Elementary School has recently been selected as one of three national winners in a program sponsored by the Concerned Businessmen's Association of America. The contest, "Set A Good Example, Don't Use Harmful Drugs," sets the stage for the awareness of drug use in our communities.

The project which the school initiated dealt with the education of students in why drugs are illegal, and most importantly, the dangers of using harmful drugs.

As a parent, I am frightened by the use of drugs in our communities. There has been a great deal of talk about how to attack the drug problem. To solve this problem, however, we must go beyond the usual rhetoric. Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have voted repeatedly to fund efforts to fight the alcohol and drug abuse problems in our Nation. The war on drugs is a war we must not lose. The war on drugs must not only be fought against the drug producers and the traffickers, but also the consumers.

Our Nation's future lies in the foundation of our children. With the valiant efforts of our children helping in the fight of this drug problem, like those children of the McKinley Elementary School, the future is much brighter for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I today not only praise wholeheartedly and support the McKinley Elementary School in this drug program, but I also urge my fellow colleagues to help stop this drug problem that faces this Nation.

TROUBLE IN THE SCHOOL YARD

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in the "Prison Fellowship" newsletter that I thought would be of interest to our colleagues. Chuck Colson writes about the dangers of a values-neutral education, and I ask that the article be printed in its entirety:

TROUBLE IN THE SCHOOL YARD

(By Chuck Colson)

Standing before a huge American flag, Barbara Walters looked sternly into the TV camera. "The alarm has sounded," she said. "The clock is ticking. But most of us are still asleep."

Nuclear threat? Acid rain? Imminent epidemic?

No, Walters was referring to the equally serious threat posed by the deterioration of American education. Test scores are plummeting. Most high-school students in her survey thought the Holocaust was "a Jewish holiday." Many couldn't locate the U.S. on a world map.

But Walters went further. The real crisis, she argued, is one of character. "Today's high-school seniors live in a world of misplaced values," she said. They have no sense of discipline. No goals. They care only for themselves. In short, they are "becoming a generation of undisciplined cultural barbarians."

We shouldn't be surprised. Modern education could not logically be expected to produce anything else.

Why? Because so-called "tolerant," "value-neutral" education, while purporting to teach no values, does in fact promote a value system of its own. And that value system is destructive to the moral restraints essential to character.

A friend recently sent me a videotape that illustrates this point. Titled "Sex, Drugs, and AIDS," it was shown in her son's high school and gives health information about how AIDS is transmitted and how it can be avoided. It even grudgingly mentions abstinence as a way to protect oneself.

But as the film ends, it becomes obvious that its agenda is not confined to AIDS information, but to teach that there's nothing wrong with homosexuality. A boy relates how he had been a gay-basher. But after discovering his own brother had AIDS, he realized that homosexuality was just another lifestyle option—one that he would not judge.

Many would defend "Sex, Drugs, and AIDS" as part of that grand American tradition known as Tolerance. Except that it is a subtle inversion of classic tolerance.

At one time tolerance meant that diversity could peacefully exist in our politically, morally, and ethnically diverse society. But our culture has become increasingly characterized by skepticism about absolute right and wrong; moral standards, and truth itself, are reduced to personal choices.

Tolerance is thus redefined as the freedom to choose from a smorgasbord of morally equivalent lifestyles—homosexuality, adultery, premarital promiscuity. Take your pick.

Allan Bloom calls this new tolerance "the virtue, the only virtue, which all primary education for more than fifty years has dedicated itself to inculcating." And this smorgasbord-style tolerance, itself a moral position, tramples on the sensibilities of any who hold to moral absolutes—particularly Christians.

"Sex, Drugs, and AIDS" is not an isolated example. A California sex-education curriculum titled Intelligent Choice of Sexual Lifestyle advises seventh graders to set a "purely personal standard of sexual behavior." A sex-ed curriculum for elementary children specifies that they will "develop an understanding of homosexuality," view films, and act out homosexual roles. So 10-year-olds can get gold stars for homosexual role play.

The value-neutral trend is of course broader than just sexual issues. What's a concerned parent to do?

Parents could insist that public school get rid of any reference to controversial moral matters—sanitizing education of anything that might conflict with instruction students receive at home. But this would reduce history, philosophy, and literature, even economics and English, to pallid gruel indeed.

Or parents could insist that, when one moral position is presented in a public school, every other view must be taught as well. Equal time for opposing opinions. Though few teachers are equipped to dispassionately argue a variety of viewpoints well, this would at least provide some remedy to today's imbalance.

Or third—and perhaps best for those who can do it—Christian parents might abandon public schools altogether, teaching their children at home or enrolling them in Christian schools. But there is a real value in the diversity in public schools that reflects American society. It allows for instruction in real tolerance—civility, cooperation, and friendship with those who are different. In this environment, the inevitable challenges to faith can result in a deepening of character.

Unfortunately, there's no simple answer. But one thing is certain. We can't look to the new administration or the media or educators themselves to truly address the crisis of values among the classroom barbarians. In the final analysis, the decisive battles will be fought in homes, in communities, before school boards and legislative committees. That means that you and I, parents and grandparents, must take up the standard.

When confronted with public schools that affirm moral positions contrary to our Christian ethic on the one hand, while self-righteously wielding the umbrella of "tolerance" with the other, we must do two things: First, we must continue to affirm Christian values in the home, equipping our children for the fray in the world outside.

And second, we must enter that fray ourselves, raising a ruckus, fighting the good fight, crying foul in the school yard. These are tests we cannot afford to fail.

**ITALY HONORS MEMPHIS
PHILANTHROPIST**

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 10, a noted philanthropist from my hometown of Memphis, TN, John A. Grisanti, Sr., will be honored by the Republic of Italy. Because this is a singular and distinctive honor, I wanted to share this news with my colleagues.

John Grisanti will be presented the Cavaliere dell'Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana; translated to English, the Knight in the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic. This prestigious award is not given lightly. It recognizes those who have distinguished themselves in their field of expertise on behalf of the Italian community.

He will be presented his knighthood at a special ceremony on the campus of Christian

Brothers College in Memphis. The honor will be bestowed on him by the Consul General of Italy, His Excellency Nardo Olivetti of New Orleans.

John Grisanti is a noted restaurateur, wine connoisseur, and philanthropist whose family has been active in the life of Memphis for generations. His family's restaurants are well known. A nationally recognized wine judge, John Grisanti appears twice in the Guinness Book of World Records, having twice purchased rare bottles of fine wine, and then sharing them with guests at fundraisers for St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital in Memphis.

He has involved himself in other community activities and causes, such as the mayor's task force for DWI, the boards of the Lupus Foundation, Epilepsy Foundation, Cerebral Palsy, Easter Seal Foundation, and the American Society.

John Grisanti has also promoted exchanges of cultures and traditions, serving as the first president of the Memphis Chapter of UNICO. It is little wonder that John Grisanti has earned the respect and friendship of the Republic of Italy just as he has won the trust and affection of so many of us in Memphis and the Midsouth.

I ask this House to join me in saluting a fine man and extending congratulations for this very significant achievement.

A TRIBUTE TO WALTER F.
WILLIAMS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention Mr. Walter F. Williams—a truly outstanding member of my community and a great American. Today, Wednesday, June 7, 1989, Mr. Williams will be presented with the Americanism Award on behalf of the Anti-Defamation League. His pursuit of excellence, commitment to family, and duty to his community and country are deeply woven into the fabric of his life.

Walt Williams is chairman, president, and chief executive officer of the Bethlehem Steel Corp.—one of our Nation's largest corporations. He serves in leadership positions with numerous business associations including the American Iron and Steel Institute, the International Iron and Steel Institute, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, the Business Council, and the Association of Iron and Steel Engineers.

Farsighted vision, concern for others, and a spirit of self-sacrifice have compelled Walt to fight for his community and his Nation. Walt is a veteran of two wars. In one, he bravely fought for freedom by serving in the U.S. Army during the Korean war. In the other—the war of global economic competitiveness—he has fought in order to provide Americans with jobs and prosperity. Walt is an unsung hero who maintains a farsighted concern for our national security on the homefront. He has sought to hoist America's flag above its foreign economic competitors by playing a crucial role in

leading Bethlehem Steel and the industry back to profitability. Though there are still challenges and battles ahead, Bethlehem Steel is ably led to meet them.

Walt's commitment to his community is also exemplified in his tireless support for training and education. He is actively involved in the Lehigh Valley Partnership and serves on the boards of Moravian College, the University of Delaware's College of Marine Studies, and Lehigh University's Iacocca Institute. Walt is also president of the Eastern Pennsylvania and Southern New Jersey Area of the Boy Scouts of America and serves on the board of the Minsi Trails Council.

No award for Walt Williams would be complete without mention of his lovely and devoted wife, Joan, who has provided so much moral and family support over the years.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I've enjoyed many years of working closely with Walt, whether on gaining the Voluntary Restraint Agreements [VRA's] or on improving steel technology. In so doing, I have gained insights from Walt's life experiences that have allowed me to do my own job better. There are not many men like Walt Williams, but when they come along you can't help but admire and honor them for their outstanding efforts and achievements. Therefore, with great pride, as his Representative in the Congress of the United States, I congratulate and salute Walter F. Williams.

"C.L.R." JAMES

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a profound feeling of sadness to mourn the passing of Cyril Lionel Robert James who was affectionately known as "C.L.R."

C.L.R. James was, in every sense of the phrase, a citizen of the world. He was a political philosopher in the Marxian mold, a historian and a novelist whose ideas made a significant impact in bringing about social change on the world scene.

C.L.R. James who was born in 1901 in Trinidad in the West Indies, died on May 31, 1989, at his home in South London's Brixton district. His Caribbean experience and the racially heterogeneous environment in which he was raised gave him a global perspective and a discriminating approach to world events. As a consequence, his views were not provincial nor were they parochial but global in scope with some emphasis on the universality of human experiences, and the creative forces of the people particularly those "lowest down."

These views are reflected in his writings including his magnum opus written in 1938, "The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution." This work has been considered a masterpiece of historical writings. It is, undoubtedly, one of the great books of 20th century scholarship. It deals with the Haitian slave insurrection that began in 1791 and was directly influenced by the ideas and actions of the French Revolution of 1789. This book adds significantly to an un-

derstanding of the expansion of Europe and the forces of colonialism and imperialism. It is also a case study of social movements and is still relevant to an understanding of contemporary conditions in Haiti. Additionally, it throws some light on the nature, scope, and possible direction of the social movements in Hungary, Poland, Russia, and China.

The writings of Charles Dickens greatly influenced the social and political philosophy of C.L.R. James. He admired Dickens' concern for and how he made vivid the plight of the poor and the downtrodden. As a consequence, the potential of the power of the people permeated his political thinking and affected his political actions.

C.L.R. James, therefore, contributed greatly to the understanding of the social and political movements in Hungary and Poland. He identified closely with the solidarity movement in Poland and would have been tremendously elated at the political success of that movement just a few days after his death.

Although a Marxist, C.L.R. James never considered Russia and China as political examples of Marxism. On the contrary, he abhorred and adamantly opposed the centrally planned economic and authoritarian rule of these countries. He frequently referred to Russia as the "serf-bureaucracy" and would have wholeheartedly applauded the contemporary efforts of the people of Russia and China in their endeavors to rest control of their lives from what he calls "a selfish bourgeoisie or an authoritarian bureaucracy."

The colonial experiences of C.L.R. James in Trinidad, then a British Crown Colony, and his interest in the poor and the downtrodden imbued him with an intense dislike for imperialism and an equally strong desire to break the bonds of colonialism, and facilitate the achievement of political independence in Africa and the Caribbean. He, therefore, played an important role in the independence movement in Africa by facilitating the breakthroughs in Ghana—Gold Coast—and Trinidad in the West Indies.

C.L.R. James and George Padmore, also from Trinidad, founded the International African Service Bureau which agitated vigorously for African independence. Both men shared and tried to implement the philosophy of Pan-Africanism and worked closely with Kwame Nkrumah in the attainment of the political independence of Ghana.

Ghana under the leadership of Nkrumah and with Padmore as the theoretician and strategist, became the political base for the growth and development of the Pan-African movement.

The United States has also been a beneficiary of the life and experiences of C.L.R. James. He lives in the United States for approximately 15 years during with time, consistent with his philosophy, he organized auto-workers in Detroit and sharecroppers in the South. During the anti-Communist campaign of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, James was interned on Ellis Island and eventually expelled from the United States in 1953. During his internship, he wrote "Mariners, Renegades and Castaways: The Story of Herman Melville and the World We Live In." This book not only gave meaningful insights into the persona of

Melville but also considerably enhanced understanding of Western civilization and the United States in a global context. James was allowed to return to the United States in the 1960's and 1970's for a series of lecture tours including a teaching role as a lecturer at Federal City College and the University of the District of Columbia.

The death of C.L.R. James certainly leaves a void in the political arena of the world. Events in Russia, Poland, China, Africa, and the Caribbean forcefully underscore the relevance, timeliness, and appropriateness of his global observations.

The Independent, a London newspaper in an obituary, referred to him as "probably the most versatile and accomplished Afro-American intellectual of the 20th century."

C.L.R. James cannot and should not be constrained by ethnicity. On the contrary, his intellectual acuity and other scholarly attributes and the analytical depth and significance of his global observations strongly suggest that he was certainly one of the most versatile and accomplished intellectuals of the 20th century.

THE CHOICE OF LIFE: TWO EXAMPLES

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and our colleagues two articles concerning the American tragedy of abortion. The first is a March 26 New York Times article written by Prof. Lawrence Lynn, who, for many years, supported abortion-on-demand in this country. The second is an article in the March issue of *About Issues* written by Dr. Bernard Nathanson, a former abortionist who led the fight to legalize abortion by founding the National Association of Repeal of Abortion Laws in 1969, now called the National Abortion Rights Action League [NARAL].

The first article is the testimony of a personal struggle with the issue of abortion, which resulted in Professor Lynn's decision to publicize his switch from proabortion to prolife. The author's view is rational and compassionate, coming from someone who was once on the other side of the issue. By his own personal example, Professor Lynn demonstrates that the prolife position is not fanatical; that abortion is not a religious issue; that being against abortion does not mean one is against equal rights for women; and, that those in the prolife movement are from diverse political backgrounds who disagree among themselves about other issues.

In the second article, Dr. Nathanson, who today argues brilliantly against abortion and is most well-known for his chilling documentary videos of actual abortions, "The Silent Scream and Eclipse of Reason," examines the history of American civil disobedience and how he believes "Operation Rescue" in the prolife movement is "in the highest moral tradition of American history."

Both of these individuals lend much credibility to the prolife position because, for many

years, they were championing the proabortion side of the issue and now realize how wrong this position was. I urge my colleagues to read these articles:

NOW, I'M AGAINST ABORTION

(By Laurence E. Lynn, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—I want to come out of a closet in which I have hidden for years. The decision to do so has been difficult, for I will lose old friends and probably not gain many new ones. My hope is that some good will come of it.

I oppose abortion. Though I have tried to convince myself otherwise. I believe a human fetus to be a human life and that we should not be permissive concerning the taking of human life. I was once permissive. I would not be again.

Would I allow exceptions to the "no abortion" rule? Yes. When the mother's life is at stake and we must choose between fetus and mother, I would favor the mother. Her life matters to those who love and need her—and to herself—and if saving her life required abortion, I would condone it.

But I would not make exceptions in cases of pregnancy resulting from rape or incest, much less when the pregnancy is simply unwanted where the only life at stake is that of the fetus.

As children and adults, we are all vulnerable to the unconscionable or deranged acts of others. Through random violence or calculated exploitation, our lives may be changed forever. Moreover, we make personal mistakes of all kinds that have adverse consequences. Our vulnerabilities do not, in my mind, justify the taking of life.

Millions of Americans opposed abortion. Why, then, have I hesitated to declare my position on this issue? The reason, is that opinion concerning abortion has become so polarized that to take a position is, quite literally, to choose one's friends. For me, this choice has painful consequences.

The abortion question is not one, apparently, on which people can disagree and still be regarded as morally responsible by their opponents.

Now, these friends inquire, in view of my concern for the poor, can I justify the bringing of unwanted children into the world, often into dreadful circumstances in which they may fail to thrive or even die? My answer is that, more than unwanted children, I fear edging too close to profoundly dangerous moral ground: deciding who shall live on the basis of criteria that presuppose our ability to predict the social consequences of such decisions.

If I am worried about losing friends, what about the prospect of new friends among those who are "pro life"? Many are unlikely to be so friendly when they realize that I also oppose capital punishment. I have no qualms about finding guilt or imposing harsh punishment, only about the taking of a life. There are other ways to deter crime.

Furthermore, my opposition to abortion is not based on sectarian religious conviction. I have been a Presbyterian all of my life, but strongly favor separation of church and state, and I distrust arguments that the state must act in accordance with religious teachings. My views on abortion are secular.

My position, then, is that, to bring out the best in us as a society, we must affirm the sanctity of human life and the obligation, insofar as it is within our power, to make life worth living. I believe that being permissive concerning abortion is inconsistent with such an affirmation.

My hope in coming out of the closet on this divisive issue is that others who are not part of the "pro life" movement—feminists, political independents, advocates for the poor—but who, for personal, nonsectarian reasons, oppose abortion, will be more willing to declare themselves. In doing so, it may make the debate less polarized and the issue more complex. Proponents of abortions who also see the issue as profoundly complicated might do the same.

The issues surrounding abortion are for many, morally complex and personally wrenching. We should not want it to appear otherwise or to decide the matter as if the question we're a simpler one.

FORWARD, TO THE PAST

(By Bernard M. Nathanson, M.D.)

This month marks my twentieth year of involvement in the abortion arena. The first five years were spent in political and medical activism on behalf of unleashing the abortion monster on an unprepared world. The next five years were spent contemplating (with increasing horror) the appalling results of that activity and determining the appropriate remedies. For the last ten years I have attempted to repair the damage: to stuff that burgeoning, ravening monster back into its cage (I pass over certain of my activities in the past two years, in which I have mined from these unique experiences profound spiritual revelations too unformed as yet to discuss here).

The monster has batted so prodigiously on the bodies and blood of its preborn victims that it seems now a Herculean task to force it back into the cage. But that task—formidable as it may appear—is the central moral imperative of our time, and to accomplish it in a politically and morally sound manner we must understand (and surrender ourselves to the concept of historical inevitability).

As a practicing physician I have always respected the noetic talents of the pathologist: he conducts the autopsy, analyzes the tissue, and informs me with an unambiguous and satisfying precision of the somatic evolution of the patient on his table. So it is with history: a careful inquest into the nature and consequences of the forces which have operated to produce change in our society in the past is indispensable to an understanding of how to "treat" the ills of the present. But enough pontificating. As the lawyers say, let's get to the instant case.

In this republic, civil rights protest movements have (with rare exceptions) followed an identifiable and rather predictable pattern (indeed, the founding of this republic itself conformed to that pattern). As a civil injustice is perceived, the forces of protest are mobilized into one coherent body which then runs smack into the resistance of the established order. Put metaphorically, the protest is a speeding object colliding with an unyielding wall (man's law, i.e. the State). The object flattens from left to right, forming a horizontal spectrum across which we may perceive the emergence of various bands (i.e. groups and organizations participating in the protest).

To the far left we discern the letter-writers, the editorialists, the pamphleteers, the educators. As we proceed rightward to the center we see the electoral activists, the legal supplicants, the judicial appellants. Moving further to the right we find a gradual hardening of attitude and resolve: those imbued with an obdurate refusal to conform to or support an unjust law sufficient to

pursue non-violent civil disobedience. Finally, on the far right there are the flashes and rumbles of violent resistance: bombing, shooting, war.

This progression from left to right in any valid protest movement involving the rights of man (and even animals) is historically inevitable if there is no relief granted by the monolithic power of the State. It is the persistent failure of the State to grant any reasonable concessions, any acceptable compromise, that is the engine which moves the protest from left to right.

I indicated earlier that this republic itself was born of a protest movement against an unconscionable overseas tyrant which obstinately refused to grant relief to the protesters. The movement proceeded from the publication of books and pamphlets anatomizing the injustices visited upon the colonies by the British tyrants, directly across the spectrum (the Boston Tea Party was quite simply non-violent protest) to the climatic event: Revolutionary War.

The anti-slavery movement began in the United States with the launching of William Lloyd Garrison's newspaper *The Liberator* in 1831—and it proceeded with that same current of historic inevitability through legal and legislative skirmishes to that immeasurable tragedy lying in wait at the far right: Civil War.

Sometimes the inexorable progression from left to right is halted as the State gropes toward perceiving the evil and grants relief. The Woman's Suffrage movement had already moved into civil disobedience in 1872, when Susan B. Anthony and her followers were arrested for voting, but before that movement slid further to the right the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was enacted, and that protest passed non-violently into history.

The black civil rights movement of the 1950s and '60s began as the quiet protest of one weary black woman on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, and progressed ineluctably through the moral suasions of the great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., across the center of the spectrum (legal action challenging the morality of segregation laws) to the right (civil disobedience, sit-ins, freedom rides) and only narrowly missed sliding to the far right with open warfare between blacks and whites—only because the State finally granted relief in the form of the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act of the middle Sixties.

The abortion question has always been, au fond, a civil rights issue. In 1969 a number of us who perceived the denial of an abortion as an affront to women and the deprivation of their civil rights organized ourselves a protest movement known as the National Association for Repeal of Abortion Laws (NARAL). With initial resistance from the State (and from organized medicine as well) the historically inevitable occurred: NARAL flattened itself into that familiar spectrum. On the left were those who advocated the pacific remedies of education, electioneering and pamphleteering. Lawrence Lader, Betty Friedan, Carol Greitzer, the Rev. Howard Moody and I moved quickly to the right, believing that the State was to be unyielding and inimical to compromise: we mounted street demonstrations, media circuses, picketing of hospitals which refused to do "therapeutic" abortions.

The Rev. Moody and I moved even farther to the right: we drew up designs for an abortion clinic to be located in the back of his church in Greenwich Village, and planned to invite the authorities in to watch me per-

form the abortion—then to arrest us all. Civil disobedience of the most flagrant confrontational sort. In fact, to our astonishment, the State of New York moved quickly to grant us relief in the form of the Abortion Statute of 1970, permitting abortion up to twenty-four weeks gestation.

Ironically, the pro-life movement is now experiencing that same inchoate sense of historical inevitability. We are in the sixteenth year of *Roe*, and although there have been nominal cosmetic moves to relief (Title X restrictions, Mexico City policy, the Hyde amendment) the body count remains the same: 4,000 daily, 1.5 million annually, 25 million to date. In short, the State has granted this civil rights movement no significant relief, and (if you have trudged along with me this far) the predictable is now reality: we are moving inexorably, ineluctably to the right, swept along by the currents of history. Enter Operation Rescue.

There is nothing mysterious, nothing incomprehensible about the genesis of this political clone of the Boston Tea Party, the Underground Railway, the Militant suffragettes, the monumentally courageous challenge by those four black college freshman who sat in at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, in February 1960 in righteous defiance of the unjust segregation laws. Operation Rescue—the resort to non-violent civil disobedience—is in the highest moral tradition of American history. Sadly, it is also a measure of the profound frustration and despair of those who would honor the laws of God over the absurdly transient, feeble edicts of man. There is no Law more compelling than that which commands us to protect the innocent, to interpose our bodies between the tormentors and the tormented—to remember the hideous curls of smoke rising from the chimneys of Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen and Birkenau.

It is said (it may be apocryphal, but who cares?) that when Henry David Thoreau was arrested and jailed for refusing to pay the poll-tax, the revenues from which were being used to support slavery, which he abominated, he was visited in prison by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Emerson was shaken, seeing his lifelong friend behind prison bars, and blurted out: "Henry, what are you doing in there?" Thoreau stared at Emerson for a long moment, then pointed his finger at him and replied: "Ralph what are you doing out there?"

Yes. Just so.

What are you doing out there?

TRIBUTE TO THE VOICE OF AMERICA

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the Voice of America for the way it has represented the American ideals of freedom and democracy during the extraordinary events now taking place in China.

Over the past few weeks, the world has been captivated by the courageous students in Tiananmen Square and their counterparts throughout China. Americans watch their emotional appeals for democracy as they happen, thanks to satellite technology and our free press. But the Chinese do not yet have that

freedom. They turn to VOA, a radio station broadcasting from halfway around the world, to find out what is happening in their own backyard. VOA's accurate and balanced news reports have earned the respect and admiration of more than 100 million Chinese listeners who want to know what the rest of the world is saying about China not the latest official news from Beijing. The Chinese Government considers VOA so important to the burgeoning democracy movement that it has started jamming VOA broadcasts for the first time in more than 10 years.

The evidence of VOA's impact can be found in large cities and small towns throughout China. Foreign correspondents report that bustling Tiananmen Square quiets to an eerie hum as the VOA broadcasts begin. Students painstakingly transcribe the VOA news bulletins on large posters for those who can't get to a radio. As the prodemocracy movement built up momentum, the *Washington Post* reported, a young Chinese worker from the countryside told of hearing two versions of the events in Beijing—one from the Central People's Radio and one from the Voice of America. The two accounts were so startling in their differences that he decided to make the 4-hour trip to see for himself. Once he got to Beijing, he realized the VOA coverage was accurate and he stayed to march for freedom of the press. VOA officials have heard hundreds of similar stories since the students took to the streets.

VOA did not garner this huge audience by chance or due to the recent turmoil. It has earned the respect of listeners in China and around the world through a tenacious adherence to the facts. The VOA is required by law to be accurate, objective, balanced, and comprehensive in its news reporting. As events in China unfolded, dedicated VOA journalists worked around the clock to confirm the latest news from Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and elsewhere. VOA correspondents in Beijing have sacrificed any thought of sleep to provide eyewitness accounts of the activity. And perhaps most important, VOA relayed news of the demonstrations in 42 other languages to hundreds of millions of listeners around the world, thus ensuring that Tiananmen Square will become a global symbol of hope and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting the hardworking staff and leadership at the Voice of America for a job well done.

STATEMENT ON THE TRAGIC SITUATION IN CHINA BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have all watched with shock, astonishment, and dismay at the events that have been unfolding in China in recent days. In this House yesterday, we adopted a resolution that condemned

"the excessive and indiscriminate use of force by the authorities of the People's Republic of China against its own citizens" and expressed the profound sympathy of the American people for the victims of the brutal repression in China.

Mr. Speaker, today I received a statement of the board of directors of the National Committee on United States-China Relations on the recent events in China and their impact on the programs of the National Committee.

The national committee, as my colleagues in the Congress well know, is an organization which has long sought to encourage the improvement of relations between the United States and China, and the members of the national committee are some of the most prominent and active Americans who have fostered improved relations with the People's Republic of China through the years.

The national committee sent its statement to leading Chinese officials, including Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, Ambassador Han Nianlong of the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs, and China's Ambassador to the United States, Han Xu. This statement is the first of this kind ever issued by the national committee.

In view of the importance of the national committee and the significance of its statement, Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be placed in the RECORD, and I urge all of my colleagues in the Congress to give it their attention:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON
UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS.
New York, NY, June 5, 1989.

The members of the Board of Directors of the National Committee on United States-China Relations are deeply saddened by recent developments in Beijing and elsewhere in the country. We view with shock and deep dismay the application of indiscriminate force by some Chinese government forces against its citizenry. Only through progressively greater political openness and dialogue between the government of China and its people can the stability, reform, and economic improvement everyone so much desires be achieved.

It is inevitable that recent and ongoing events will have repercussions throughout the world and that China's cooperative international relations will be disrupted in many ways. Relations with the United States already have been adversely affected, a situation all the more tragic because Americans are united in their desire to have a warm and mutually beneficial relationship with China's people.

The National Committee regrets that events have necessitated the postponement of several of our programs. We believe deeply in the importance of healthy Sino-American relations, ongoing dialogue, and efforts at mutual understanding. Our policy will be to work with Chinese individuals and organizations which share our commitment to these goals and we look forward to a time when the atmosphere for productive programs will again exist.

The Members of the Board of Directors of the National Committee on United States-China Relations are: Raymond Philip Shafer, Chairman; Caroline L. Ahmanson, Robert A. Levinson, Robert S. McNamara, Lucian W. Pye, and Henry P. Sailer, Vice Chairmen; Martha Redfield Wallace, Treasurer; Kathryn D. Christopherson, Secretary; and Members of the Board: A.

Doak Barnett, Gordon Bennett, Shirley Temple Black, John Brademas, Edmund G. Brown, Alison Stilwell Cameron, Chou Wen-Chung, Jerome A. Cohen, Charles J. Conroy, Marshall B. Coyne, William A. Delano, Daniel W. Derbes, John Diebold, Gerald R. Ford, Marshall Green, Maurice R. Greenberg, Stanford D. Greenberg, Armand Hammer, Herbert J. Hansell, Harry Harding, Jr., Richard C.A. Holbrooke, Frederick W. Hong, Eric Hotung, Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., Nicholas R. Lardy, Gloria E. Lemon, Stanley B. Lubman, Richard W. Lyman, D. Bruce McMahan, Douglas P. Murray, Michel Oksenberg, Frederick O'Neal, Arthur H. Rosen, Robert A. Scalapino, Susan L. Shirk, Elmer Staats, Carl F. Stover, Walter S. Surrey, A. Alfred Taubman, Richard L. Walker, Allen S. Whiting, Margaret S. Wilson, and Harold Wolchok. Directors Emeriti are Robert O. Anderson, Everett Case; John K. Fairbank; Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.; Philip M. Klutznick; and Tang Tsou. David M. Lampton, President; and Jan Carol Berris, Vice President.

H.R. 1502

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 13, 1989, H.R. 1502, the District of Columbia Police Authorization and Expansion Act of 1989, will be called up under the suspension calendar. H.R. 1502 is the result of a bipartisan compromise reached between the majority and minority side of the Committee on the District of Columbia. In the spirit of full cooperation, we have been able to draft legislation that is the cornerstone of a four stage plan to confront the drug menace in the District of Columbia.

During the course of the committee debate, it became apparent to all committee members that the issue before us was one of such consequence that we had to set aside areas of division and work diligently and cooperatively to achieve our common goal, which is the eradication of drugs and drug-related violence from the streets of our Nation's Capital. The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Honorable RONALD V. DELUMS; the ranking Republican of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Honorable STAN PARRIS; and I determined that we would do everything in our power to bring to the floor a sound piece of legislation. H.R. 1502 as amended, is that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1502 as amended, and assure this body that we will work for its passage in the Senate as well as its signing by the President.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1502 as amended, is only a first step but it is a giant first step on a long journey.

CHRISTYANNE COLLINS PROLIFE HEROINE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the testimony of a courageous woman who is a heroine to many for her steadfast and self-sacrificing commitment to protecting the lives of innocent preborn babies. For many years, prolife activist Christyanne Collins has counseled hundreds of women who have been led to believe that abortion is the only solution to their crisis pregnancy.

On May 16, 1989, Christyanne Collins appeared before Judge Richard Salzman of the District of Columbia Court for sentencing. He had convicted her of unlawful entry for standing in the public hallway outside Washington's New Summit Women's Clinic in order to give women information about positive alternatives to abortion. Judge Salzman sentenced her to 9 months in prison—5 months suspended—of which she served over 90 days until released by prison officials to relieve overcrowding.

The following is a transcript of her extemporaneous comments immediately prior to her sentencing which was printed in the February issue of American Life League's "About Issues." Her honest words and her selfless actions illustrate her great compassion for women and children.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. CHRISTYANNE COLLINS, DEFENDANT—CRIMINAL ACTION No. M762-88

"Your Honor, there are several comments I would like to make. The first is that you cannot rehabilitate people from doing something good; you cannot rehabilitate people from resisting evil.

"My second comment regards the pre-sentence report issued by my probation officer, particularly her recommendation for psychiatric evaluation and ongoing psychological counseling.

"I can't help but marvel. Most of the people sitting in the front row of this courtroom earn their living from the abortion industry. If I did to an animal what this court sanctions their doing to children, you would call me mentally deranged. Yet, because I know and act as if these aborted children are not merely globs of tissue, but children made in the image of God, and because I resent seeing them reduced to arms and legs, smashed skulls, eyeballs and broken rib cages, I am the one you seek to punish and deter and subject to psychiatric evaluation.

"I know abortion is the brutal murder of a baby, and have made the decision I would rather face any sanction this court could impose upon me for resisting that evil rather than have to live with my heart, mind and soul if I were to comply with what this court expects me to do: become a silent, accepting observer of the murder.

"When I realize my failure to comply puts me and not them at the point of psychiatric evaluation, I know there is something terribly, terribly wrong. May God forgive.

"Your Honor, you have, throughout the trial, talked about the laws of this land. The fundamental right of every American citizen is the right to life, a right our Constitution

declares an unalienable right endowed by our Creator. It is not something you or I or the State can choose to give or take away.

"Whether a person is pre-born, dying of AIDS, mentally incompetent, retarded, physically handicapped or otherwise not perfect or unwanted by some, life is not something we can choose to throw away or minimize.

"We have seen the time when, in our society, blacks, who, by the mere color of their skin, were told they were not human beings; they could be separated from their families, beaten, sold or killed. These actions were entirely sanctioned by the courts who denied their personhood, and were resisted by men and women who knew the laws were evil.

"We have seen times in our history when people, because of their nationality (Jewish) were brutalized in concentration camps and condemned to die in gas ovens. And even today—40 years after the Holocaust events—we have a world of people still seeking to punish those responsible.

"Today, throughout the world, people are looking at Kurt Waldheim of Austria. We say, that man should have done something. We say he shouldn't have simply followed orders simply because the law allowed brutality; we say he should have resisted because he knew the acts were evil.

"In the 40 years since the events of the Nazi Holocaust, there are many who believe he should still be held accountable for his failure to do right, and for his participation in the state-sanctioned evil. Will the same be said of us, who have for so long accepted the murder of our children?

"Your Honor, I want you to know I respect the law greatly. I respect the law that says every human being, every American citizen, has the unalienable right to life.

"I am not called to yield my conscience to the legislature and I am not called to elevate the state to the place of God in my life.

"If the laws of this courtroom and the laws of the land that sanction the brutal murder of an unborn child ever become more important than the fact that these children are made in the image of God, and are children He would protect, then I will have failed at what is most important in my life: obedience to God.

"I am terrified to walk through those doors into your jail, Your Honor, and I don't mind telling you that. I am not an evil person. I am not a criminal. And I do not belong in your jails; except under your standard of justice which protects murder and convicts those who act in defense of life.

"I am a person who cares a whole lot for other people. I know when I walk through that door into your jail, life is going to be painful for me.

"Yet it will not be nearly as painful as I had freedom on the outside because of refusing to live by my conscience. To have the freedom to go about my daily business, because I am afraid of the consequences the law might impose for resisting evil, would leave me a pretty empty human being.

"Finally, Your Honor, I want to say the day is going to come when you and I and the abortionists sitting in the front row of this courtroom are going to stand before a different judge. Today I face temporal consequences for my action to love and protect preborn children. I am willing to do that.

"I would far rather pay any consequences you can impose upon me for my commitment to loving these children and their mothers, than to one day face the Right-

eous Judge and have to say I was not faithful to the call of Christ.

"I cannot change who I am, Your Honor. Indeed, I would not want to be any different than I am in regard to this issue. As I said, you cannot rehabilitate me from loving women who are devastated by their abortion decisions, and from trying to prevent other women from making the same destructive decisions.

"If refusal to act on their behalf is rehabilitation, I don't want it. I can only say to you and the other people you represent, your colleagues, officers of the court, Ms. McHenry my prosecutor, and those sitting in the front row representing the abortion industry: The day is going to come when you will all face that different Judge.

"When that day comes, I want you to know that I and most of the people in this courtroom will be praying for each of you, that you will come to a reconciliation between right and wrong, and have given your allegiance to God's justice.

"That is all I have to say, Your Honor."

A TRIBUTE TO "MR. ENGLISH"

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 11, the citizens of Simsbury, CT, will gather to honor John F. Klingler, who is also known as Mr. English. A teacher for 38 years, Mr. Klingler has also served as department chair for 28 years, and has worked tirelessly to afford the students at Simsbury High School unique opportunities to grow and learn.

Mr. Klingler has professed a strong commitment to an unusual interpretation of the three R's—reading, writing and right word. The development of a complete curriculum stressing more than a basic understanding and usage of the English language has yielded truly remarkable results. Simsbury High School is justifiably proud that more than 1 graduate in 10 has been recognized by the National Merit Scholarship Program for academic achievement.

Believing in the total development of the student, Mr. Klingler has not limited his involvement to purely academic endeavors. He has served as faculty advisor to the SHS Yearbook, the Pinnacle, and coach of the teams competing on "As Schools Match Wits," and he is recognized on the campus for his commitment to the students, a constant presence urging them on to achieve their greatest potential, both as students and as individuals. Mr. Klingler refers to his students as "my diamonds." Mr. Klingler has devoted himself to sculpting and polishing the intellects of his students, creating truly precious gems, knowing what an invaluable gift a sharp mind and a strong sense of personhood is to each of them. I join with the citizens of Simsbury in offering my sincerest congratulations to and appreciation for the very successful efforts of John F. Klingler.

THEODORE A. LEVINE—A TRIBUTE TO HIS 35 YEARS OF COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Theodore A. Levine, who is retiring after serving the Springfield school system as a teacher and principal for 35 years.

Ted Levine is a graduate of Springfield Classical High School, American International College, and the University of Massachusetts. He served as principal of the Eastern Avenue and School Street Schools from 1962 to 1966, and for the past 22 years, he has been the principal of Homer Street School.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no more difficult job than serving as an educator in an urban school system. It is a demanding profession in which the obstacles seem insurmountable and achievements often go unrecognized.

I would be greatly remiss if I did not acknowledge the contributions Ted has made to the Springfield school system. I cannot think of anyone who has shown the sort of career-long devotion to education that he has. For more than three decades Ted Levine has given of his time and his talents to literally generations of young men and women who today are better citizens for having known him. I am pleased to join with his colleagues, friends, and family on the occasion of his retirement from the Springfield school system, and I extend my personal congratulations and special thanks for his extraordinary dedication and service in developing the minds of our youth.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BUCKLING-UP

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a very important problem in America that we can all solve instantly—it is transportation safety. My home State of Florida has been working vigorously to bring to the attention of all Florida residents and visitors, of which there are many, the need to buckle up and use child safety devices.

Do you know Mr. Speaker, that one Tampa hospital did a survey that showed 60 to 70 percent of babies were taken home from the hospital without the use of child restraints. Imagine that—with automobile accidents leading the pace as the No. 1 killer of children in our Nation.

In Pasco County, in my congressional district, the community is doing something about this problem. Between January and the end of March this year their usage of safety belts and child seats went from 26 percent to 53 percent. As a result, Susan Samson came to Washington recently on behalf of the commu-

nity's success to receive a National Community Achievement Award from the American Coalition of Traffic Safety. I am proud of Florida and Pasco County's efforts to educate the community on this important issue. I hope we will all take this message throughout the country until no lives are needlessly lost on our highways.

**JAPAN MUST OPEN ITS MARKET
NOW**

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means—Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. CRANE—for having the wisdom to bring to the House floor a resolution that asks the President to enforce the 1986 United States-Japan Semiconductor Agreement and prevent further unfair Japanese trade practices.

As we all know, the President recently cited Japan for unfair trade practices under the Super 301 provisions of our trade law. However, the President did not add Japanese semiconductor trade practices to his list of priority practices. It is vital to understand, as I have been assured, that the President viewed Super 301 as requiring a listing of new areas of unfair trading practices, and that is why he singled out telecommunications, supercomputers, and timber. The omission of semiconductors was decidedly not a condoning of the present state of United States access to Japanese markets, which remains deplorable. It reflected merely the fact that there was already in force a set of sanctions against Japan in connection with our semiconductor trade. This resolution is an extremely important measure because it urges the President to continue to enforce the 1986 agreement and help our semiconductor firms achieve fair access into the Japanese markets.

The 1986 agreement calls on the Japanese to stop dumping semiconductors in our market and provide substantially increased access by foreign firms in the Japanese market. While the USTR has determined that Japanese dumping of chips has subsided, our chip manufacturers still do not have fair market access in Japan. Many fine U.S. firms such as Intel, AMD, Motorola, and National Semiconductor have been successful in their efforts to penetrate most foreign markets. However, their sales to Japan continue to lag far behind their efforts in other markets. This is difficult to understand given the high Japanese demand for semiconductors in consumer electronics, telecommunications, and computers.

I am puzzled by the unwillingness of the Japanese to provide fair access to our semiconductors given the restraint that we have shown toward Japan in the past. For instance, in return for the 1986 agreement we suspended a number of unfair trade practices against Japan for its semiconductor trade practices. In 1987, the President did assess limited sanctions upon Japan for its failure to give us fair

access into its semiconductor market. I fear that unless Japan starts to comply fully with the 1986 agreement, support for much sterner trade measures will once again increase on Capitol Hill, perhaps leading to a wave of protectionism. I am hopeful that the President will direct the USTR to enter into negotiations to resolve this matter as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of House Resolution 146 with over 400 of my colleagues. Not one Member of the House of Representatives voted against this measure. I am confident that the President will take this message seriously and move quickly to enforce this agreement.

**REMANUFACTURING AND OUR
DEFENSE INDUSTRY**

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should place a greater emphasis on the remanufacture of existing military equipment in order to maintain readiness during a period of budget constraints, production delays and cost overruns of new equipment.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the remanufacturing process and what it can offer to DOD in the way of cost savings, effectiveness, and timely replacement of aging equipment, I have prepared the following paper for your information:

REMANUFACTURING

At a time when DOD investment budgets are critically austere, the remanufacturing process provides a viable alternative to new material acquisitions, and is a more comprehensive application of a service life extension program (SLEP). Remanufacturing is a means of meeting mandated Force levels at a considerable cost savings to the Government as compared to the current cost of equivalent new material.

Remanufacturing is a speciality industry that is not as dominant as original equipment manufacturing and is accordingly less popular. Remanufacturing does, however, represent a unique set of skills and capabilities that must address the challenge of starting with products that have, through use and age, transformed to various states of wear and disrepair. From these conditions the remanufacturing process must reshape, replace, rebuild, improve, test and deliver a product that is better than new, and at a clear savings in both initial and life cycle costs.

Remanufacturing should therefore warrant serious attention from DOD, and in particular from the Army who is now tasked with developing solutions to fielding large quantities of high quality equipment with a markedly constrained budget.

ARMY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE (MTV) FLEET

A prime candidate for the application of a comprehensive remanufacturing program is the Army's older fleet of 2½ and 5 ton trucks commonly referred to as medium tactical vehicles (MTV). Traditional Army material policy preferences the acquisition of new products such as the current Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles (FMTV) program.

However, the Army will probably not receive sufficient budget authority to procure the new FMTVs in the quantities needed to preclude a period of perilous fleet shortages from 1990 to at least 2000 without a remanufacturing program for its older vehicles. The Army's MTV fleet difficulties are further compounded by aging assets that are deteriorating faster than they can be properly maintained, and by spiraling maintenance costs that have become increasingly prohibitive.

DEPOT LEVEL MAINTENANCE

Depot level maintenance is an essential service program that is sometimes overestimated as the Government's in-house resource for meeting complete equipment renewal requirements. Depot level maintenance is in fact more reactive to system and component-specific service requirements and is, therefore, less comprehensive than a total remanufacturing program.

The Service Depots are normally chartered to perform structured overhaul and rebuild work on equipment, systems and components on an as-needed basis. The Depots are also encouraged to perform their peace-time mission during one standard work shift, and to hold in reserve the capacity for two additional work shifts to meet surges and mobilization requirements. Service Depots are, therefore, not necessarily structured or organized to perform comprehensive remanufacturing operations.

PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT

Product improvement and modernization is another important benefit of the remanufacturing process. Remanufacturing provides the opportunity for early integration of several new state-of-the-art systems and components that have been developed for the next generation of MTVs, but are otherwise available for application and fielding now. These systems and components are specifically engineered to enhance vehicle performance, to improve vehicle reliability and maintainability, to extend vehicle useful life expectancy, and to reduce vehicle life cycle cost.

DEMONSTRATED JUSTIFICATIONS

Industry experience clearly demonstrates remanufacturing can be justified as a practical and timely alternative whose benefits are manifold. The most salient of these are summarized as follows:

A remanufactured truck with select product improvements should cost 55-65 percent of the equivalent product's current new cost.

Remanufacturing typically extends the service life of a truck by 100 percent.

Remanufacturing can be the pivotal and timely means for closing the imbalance of conventional forces that exists between the U.S. and adversary nations.

Remanufacturing resources can effectively strengthen and sustain our industrial base.

Let's send a clear message that Congress believes in exploring and implementing any and all methods of achieving military preparedness within the framework of an extremely tight budget. I hope you will all join me as a cosponsor of this important legislation.

SALUTE TO PATRICIA RUPLEY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Patricia Rupley of Richmond, CA, on the occasion of her retirement from the Richmond Unified School District.

Pat Rupley is an outstanding citizen in my district. Through her many years of dedication to education, she has touched the lives of the West Contra Costa community. Her constant commitment to our young people is evident in the success of the Richmond Unified alumni, both past and present.

While often seen as a leader by fellow Richmond Unified teachers and administrators, Pat has enjoyed a long and successful career. Beginning as a math teacher at Helms Junior High School in 1953, she quickly began to ascend into the district's administration, holding positions as counselor, dean, and instructional vice principal. In 1979, upon becoming principal of Kennedy High School, she proudly became Richmond Unified's first woman high school principal. Today, after 36 years, Pat holds the position of special assistant to the superintendent, again being the first woman to hold a position within the superintendent's cabinet.

Despite being out of the classroom for a large part of her career, Pat has maintained a close rapport with the students and their families. She has continually proven to be a positive influence on those whom the system has been unable to reach. Her individual attention to those who needed her support and guidance has allowed for many students to successfully complete their education and enter adult life with the skills necessary to succeed.

Pat's contributions have indeed made West Contra Costa County a better place to live and work, and I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing this exceptional individual.

REINVIGORATING CONGRESS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the most thoughtful opinion piece by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable LEE HAMILTON, which appeared in the June 6, 1989 edition of the Washington Post. The gentleman is to be commended for his insightful analysis of the state of the 101st Congress, and especially for his very specific call to action. He is right on target.

It is time for all of us to move to reform and reinvigorate Congress. We do need to put tough but effective ethics reforms in place. We must act expeditiously to reform our campaign finance laws. We must ban honoraria.

If we want the American people to respect this institution, then we must demonstrate that we collectively respect it ourselves. We have to end our attacks on the Congress as an in-

stitution. We must put into place clear, effective, and appropriate rules that facilitate the business of legislating and discourage parliamentary impasse and inaction.

Our very distinguished colleague from Indiana is right. This Congress needs to get its own house in order and get on with the Nation's business.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1989]

REINVIGORATING CONGRESS

(By Lee H. Hamilton)

Members of Congress have had some unpleasant reading in recent days. A Post editorial says Congress needs a bath. Headlines tell us we are stuck in an ethics quagmire. Polls remind us that the dominant attitudes expressed by people toward Congress are cynicism and mistrust. Adding to this is a state of disarray, a sense of opportunity being lost, and suspicion and acrimony. The public's business is not being taken care of. It is time to take steps to reinvigorate Congress.

First, we need to enact a package of tough ethics reforms. Tightening congressional ethics rules would clarify the standards for members and increase public confidence in Congress. We should tighten congressional rules on gifts and the use of campaign funds and should further limit sources of outside income to reduce potential conflicts of interest. We should also clarify our Code of Official Conduct to make it clear to members that their conduct should conform to broad standards of good conduct, whether or not they may technically avoid some of the legalistic nuances of a specific rule. We need to greatly expand the "preventative ethics" role of the Standards Committee—broadening its advisory and informational efforts to try to head off possible cases of misconduct before they occur.

Second, we need to reform our campaign finance laws. Members must spend an enormous amount of time fund-raising, and special-interest money is flooding our system of government in unprecedented amounts. We should give candidates incentives (such as reduced postage rates and discounted broadcasting costs) to accept campaign spending limits. We should lessen the power of special interest PACs by, for example, capping the amount of PAC contributions a candidate could accept and curbing "independent expenditures."

Third, we should support a modest pay increase tied to a ban on honoraria. A modest increase to partially offset past losses due to inflation, plus indexing future pay, might be perceived as reasonable. In return, we should ban all congressional honoraria. Banning honoraria from special interests would go a long way toward restoring public confidence in Congress, but there is no chance of eliminating them without a pay raise.

Fourth, we need to stop the partisan ethics attacks on one another. Much of the damage of the House in recent months has been self-inflicted, as each party attacks the ethics of opposing members for political advantage. Leaders of both parties need to sit down and talk about reining in the attacks to allow us to get down to the serious business of governing. We seem to have lost sight of the fact that the first duty of all members of Congress is to work together to govern effectively.

Fifth, we in Congress need to stop bad-mouthing the institution of Congress. We need to stop running for Congress by running against Congress. Americans will not

acclaim an institution that their own members disclaim. Members who make distorted demeaning statements about Congress should face disciplinary action. Most members of Congress are honest, conscientious and hard-working, and we should start saying that.

Sixth, we need to enact institutional reforms to improve the effectiveness of Congress. We need to reduce the excessive number of subcommittees tying up legislation, cut down the number of times the same issue is considered on the floor, and make it more difficult to miss budget deadlines. We also need to stop hiding tax and spending benefits for narrow interests behind obscure language in omnibus bills. Congress must be able to pull itself together and produce a program to respond to the issues of the day. Today it does not have the integrative mechanisms to mobilize itself, blend its product into a consistent policy and give the country a sense of direction. We need to strengthen the capacity of Congress to govern.

Finally, we need to tackle the tough problems on the American agenda. We have become too timid legislatively, often dealing with issues that are of only marginal interest to most Americans, while avoiding the tough issues in order to protect our chances of reelection. We need to stop playing games with the budget, go after popular but counterproductive tax benefits and make the kinds of investments—in education, R&D, and infrastructure—that are needed for securing America's economic future. One of the best ways for Congress to become respected again is for it to do a respectable job.

We are in a rough patch now, but I have confidence in Congress and its ability to overcome its problems. Getting our own house in order, members recognize, is essential if we are to get on with taking care of the nation's business.

REPRESENTATIVE HORTON
HONORED AT DINNER TO BENEFIT ISRAEL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Members of this body. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with my colleague from New York, Representative FRANK HORTON. I believe FRANK should be recognized for his dedication and service to the public.

FRANK is chairman of the New York Bipartisan Congressional Delegation and has served in Congress for 27 years. Recently FRANK was honored with a State of Israel's bonds testimonial dinner in tribute to FRANK HORTON. FRANK was the recipient of Israel's Jerusalem Medal. Over \$2 million was raised for the State of Israel bonds. I believe the following statement by the president of Rochester Institute of Technology, Dr. Richard M. Rose, accurately depicts FRANK HORTON's career in Congress and his dedication to the right of self-determination in the Middle East.

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN CHINA

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, the world has been horrified by the wanton brutality now taking place in the People's Republic of China.

The inconceivable attacks by the Chinese Army—using bayonets, machineguns, and battle tanks to slaughter unarmed Chinese civilians in the streets of Beijing—has cast a permanent, blood-soaked stain of malevolence upon the Chinese leadership which ordered the assaults.

The American people have been deeply moved by the courage of the Chinese people who have confronted this oppression. The peaceful Chinese demonstrators for democracy struggled defiantly against overwhelming odds, armed only with their convictions and their desire for the most basic human and civil rights.

For China, this is a time of chaos. But here in America, we should commit ourselves as individuals and as a nation, to ensure that the ideals of those who have sacrificed their lives in the name of peace, in the name of democracy, shall not themselves die.

POLAND'S JOURNEY TOWARD FREEDOM

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 4, 1989, the trade union Solidarity was overwhelmingly victorious in the first truly democratic elections held in Poland in over 40 years. Unofficial projections indicate that 160 out of the 161 Solidarity candidates for the lower house, the Sejm, will be elected in the first round of voting without a runoff election. In addition, over 90 of the 100 Solidarity candidates for the newly created Senate will be elected in the first round. I rejoice in the triumph of Solidarity in these elections. The people of Poland have spoken clearly and unequivocally.

Preliminary results also indicate that perhaps all of the 35 senior ruling party officials running unopposed for the Sejm on the national list have been rejected by the voters. The Polish people have stood firmly for freedom in these elections. The ruling party and Solidarity now face a legal and political quandary. There is no provision for replacing the national list candidates, but a constitutional article requires that all 460 seats in the Sejm be filled.

I urge both sides to come together and fashion a settlement that is acceptable to all and will not endanger the tremendous reforms that have been recently gained. The ruling government must live up to its promises of democracy.

Poland is on the verge of a great awakening. There is no turning back now. My prayers

are with my Polish brothers and sisters during this time of great change. May Poland's journey toward freedom continue.

THE IMPORTANCE OF R&D

HON. BERYL ANTHONY, JR.

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1989

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, technological innovation is critical to this Nation's economy and to our general welfare—because it bolsters our economy with both marketable products and heightened productivity—and because it provides the promise for solving a number of our most pressing problems.

Of course, scientific and technological innovation is predicated on vigorous research and development, and any nation that wants to reap the benefits of innovation encourages R&D. That's why our competitors in the world marketplace do their best to encourage, and to attract, research and development efforts.

Yet, despite the importance of R&D, for over a decade, the U.S. Tax Code has included a tax regulation that discourages domestic research and development: Section 861-8.

Congress has continually recognized the problems with section 861 and has approved five separate moratoriums to prevent its implementation. Legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today is an attempt to once and for all end the controversy over this regulation, and to encourage U.S.-based research and development, by permanently reforming section 861.

Section 861 taxes U.S. R&D performers as if they were conducting part of their U.S. R&D in foreign countries. Since other countries obviously don't allow deductions for expenses incurred in the United States, the new result is to deny companies the full deduction for their R&D expenditures.

No other nation treats R&D performed within its borders as if it were performed elsewhere. Therefore, under the section 861 U.S. R&D penalty, American companies have an incentive to locate their R&D facilities in foreign countries.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Re-

marks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 1989, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on manpower programs.

SR-232A

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on scenic byways.

SD-406

Small Business

Rural Economy and Family Farming Subcommittee

To hold hearings to assess the impact of S. 863, proposed Rural Access to Capital Act, and S. 851, proposed Small Business Rural Revitalization Act on small business.

SR-428A

Select on Indian Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 521 and provisions of H.R. 881, measures to provide for restoration of the Federal trust relationship with, and assistance to the Coquille Tribe of Indians and the individual members consisting of the Coquille Tribe of Indians, and S. 321, to revise provisions of law that provide a preference to Indians; to be followed by oversight hearings on the implementation of amendments to the Indian Self Determination Act.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the state of agricultural research.

SR-332

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 566, the National Affordable Housing Act, focusing on homeownership affordability.

SD-538

Foreign Relations

To resume mark up of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1990 for foreign assistance programs.

SD-419

Government Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to review Federal drug interdiction capabilities and coordination, focusing on the role of the Department of Defense.

SD-342

2:00 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on title I of S. 13, provisions of S. 564 and S. 1092, Amendment No. 110 (S. 190), and other recommendations in the report of the Commission on Veterans Education

Policy regarding military and VA programs.

SD-418

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Government Information and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Delos Cy Jamison, of Montana, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, and Frank A. Bracken, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

SD-366

Finance

To resume hearings on child care and child health legislation.

SD-215

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposals for U.S. assistance to Cambodia.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Richard H. Solomon, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific Affairs, Della M. Newman, of Washington, to be Ambassador to New Zealand and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to Western Samoa, Robert D. Orr, of Indiana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Singapore, and Melvin F. Sembler, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Australia and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru.

SD-419

JUNE 13

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee

To resume open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic programs.

SD-192

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services
Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas J. Murrin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1036, to improve the economic, community, and educational well-being of rural America.

SR-332

Finance

To hold hearings on S. 800, to provide for a moratorium on and study of cer-

tain State income tax provisions which affect nonresidents.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Department of Energy's role in the area of magnetic fusion and inertial confinement fusion research and development and demonstration, and S. 964, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for civilian energy programs of the Department of Energy.

SD-366

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Melvyn Levitsky, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters and Jewel S. Lafontant, of Illinois, to be U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador-at-Large.

SD-419

Judiciary

Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 594, to establish an independent corps of administrative law judges necessary to review and evaluate a wide variety of issues.

SD-226

Small Business

To hold hearings on the impact of proposed user fees by the Food and Drug Administration on small business.

SR-428A

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on the Middle East, Pakistan, and Afghanistan.

SD-138

Finance

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1129, to simplify the antidiscrimination rules applicable to certain employee benefit plans and proposed child care and child health legislation.

SD-215

JUNE 14

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue mark up of S. 1036, to improve the economic, community, and educational well-being of rural America.

SR-332

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the diversity and concentration of media ownership.

SR-253

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider S. 110, Family Planning Amendments, S. 120, Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Care, and Research Grants Act, S. 54, Age Discrimination in Employment Waiver Protection Act, and pending nominations.

SD-430

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on certain provisions of S. 13, S. 86, S. 192, S. 405, and S. 846, bills to strengthen and improve VA health care programs, and related measures.

SR-418

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services
Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee

To resume closed and open hearings on S. 1085, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of Defense, focusing on NATO nuclear deterrence.

SR-222

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 646, to facilitate cooperation between the United States and foreign countries in securities law enforcement, and on the globalization of securities markets.

SD-538

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on S. 7, S. 56, S. 137, S. 242, S. 330, S. 332, S. 359, and S. 597, bills to provide for spending limits and public financing for Federal elections.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition and Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Program and child nutrition programs.

SR-332

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of E. Patrick Coady, of Virginia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Fred M. Zeder II, of New York, to be President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of James B. Busey IV of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SR-253

JUNE 15

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue work up of S. 1036, to improve the economic, community, and educational well-being of rural America.

SR-332

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for the Department of Defense.

SD-192

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 646, to facilitate cooperation between the United States and foreign countries in securities law enforcement, and on the globalization of securities markets.

SD-538

- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 561, to provide for testing for the use, without lawful authorization, of alcohol or controlled substances by the operators of aircraft, railroads, and commercial motor vehicles. SR-253
- Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 964, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for civilian energy programs of the Department of Energy, and to hold hearings on S. 488, to provide Federal assistance to a program of research, development, and demonstration of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1990 for conservation and renewable energy programs of the Department of Energy. SD-366
- Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on alcohol abuse prevention. SD-342
- 9:45 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald Phinney Gregg, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea. SD-419
- 2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition and Investigations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Program and child nutrition programs. SR-332
- Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on the World Bank, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, International Monetary Fund, and Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency. SD-138
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jeffrey N. Shane, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation. SR-253
- JUNE 16
- 9:30 a.m.
Finance
Medicare and Long-Term Care Subcommittee
To resume hearings on physician payment reform under the Medicare program. SD-215
- Governmental Affairs
Government Information and Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Paperwork Reduction Act. SD-342
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 566, the National Affordable Housing Act, focusing on rental assistance and public housing. SD-538
- JUNE 19
- 10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1990 for the U.S. Coast Guard. SR-253
- JUNE 20
- 9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review mechanisms for establishing priorities in agricultural research programs. SR-332
- Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 724, to modify the boundaries of the Everglades National Park and to provide for the protection of lands, waters, and natural resources within the park. SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on Central America. SD-138
- JUNE 21
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the diversity and concentration of media ownership. SR-253
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 640, to establish guidelines for Federal standards of liability for general aviation accidents. SR-301
- Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on alcohol abuse prevention. SD-342
- 1:30 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the sustainability of forest resources. SR-332
- 2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on super computers. SR-253
- Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous public lands measures, including S. 558, S. 560, S. 818, S. 855, S. 940, and S. 963. SD-366
- JUNE 22
- 8:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 404, H.R. 1415, and S. 898, to extend certain Department of Veterans' Affairs home loan guaranty provisions, and related measures. SR-418
- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review conservation and agricultural practices. SR-332
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the diversity and concentration of media ownership. SR-253
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1990 for foreign assistance programs. SD-138
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1005, relating to the sale, purchase, or other acquisition of certain railroads. SR-253
- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to review trends in domestic CO₂ emissions as they contribute to the phenomenon of global warming. SD-366
- JUNE 23
- 9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 253, to establish a coordinated National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Program. SD-342
- Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on administration of Indian programs by the Environmental Protection Agency. SR-485
- 2:00 p.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on administration of Indian programs by the Environmental Protection Agency. SR-485
- JULY 11
- 9:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 710, S. 711, and S. 712, bills to provide for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico. SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 964, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for civilian energy programs of the Department of Energy, and on fossil energy research and development and the clean coal technology program. SD-366

JULY 12

9:00 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Communications Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 707, to require the Federal Communications Commission to reinstate restrictions on advertising during children's television, to enforce the obligation of broadcasters to meet the educational and informational needs of the child audience.
 SR-253

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Merchant Marine Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on capabilities and concerns of the national sealift policy.
 SR-253

Veterans' Affairs
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
 SR-418

10:00 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 To resume hearings on S. 710, S. 711, and S. 712, bills to provide for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.
 SD-366

JULY 14

10:00 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 To continue hearings on S. 710, S. 711, and S. 712, bills to provide for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.
 SD-366

JULY 18

9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 964, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for civilian energy programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on reactor research and development, and on commercial efforts to develop advanced nuclear reactor technologies.
 SD-366

JULY 19

9:00 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Communications Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 999, relating to the broadcasting of certain material regarding candidates for Federal elective office.
 SR-253

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 964, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for civilian energy programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on reactor research and development, and on commercial efforts to develop advanced nuclear reactor technologies.
 SD-366

Veterans' Affairs
 Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to revise certain provisions of VA health care programs, including S. 13, S. 86, S. 165, S. 192, S. 263, S. 405, S. 564, S. 574, S. 748, and S. 846.
 SR-418

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.
 Select on Indian Affairs
 To hold hearings to establish a Tribal Judicial Resource Center.
 SR-485

JULY 26

9:00 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Communications Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 1009, relating to the purchase of broadcasting time by candidates for public office.
 SR-253